

Quantitative Models and Implicit Complexity

Ugo Dal Lago*

Martin Hofmann†

Abstract

We give new proofs of soundness (all representable functions on base types lies in certain complexity classes) for Elementary Affine Logic, **LFPL** (a language for polytime computation close to realistic functional programming introduced by one of us), Light Affine Logic and Soft Affine Logic. The proofs are based on a common semantical framework which is merely instantiated in four different ways. The framework consists of an innovative modification of realizability which allows us to use resource-bounded computations as realisers as opposed to including all Turing computable functions as is usually the case in realizability constructions. For example, all realisers in the model for **LFPL** are polynomially bounded computations whence soundness holds by construction of the model. The work then lies in being able to interpret all the required constructs in the model. While being the first entirely semantical proof of polytime soundness for light logics, our proof also provides a notable simplification of the original already semantical proof of polytime soundness for **LFPL**. A new result made possible by the semantic framework is the addition of polymorphism and a modality to **LFPL** thus allowing for an internal definition of inductive datatypes.

1 Introduction

In recent years, a large number of characterizations of complexity classes based on logics and lambda calculi have appeared. At least three different principles have been exploited, namely linear types [3, 9], restricted modalities in the context of linear logic [7, 1, 12] and non-size-increasing computation [8]. Although related one to the other, these systems have been studied with different, often unrelated methodologies and few results are known about relative intentional expressive power. We believe that this area of implicit computational complexity needs unifying frameworks for the analysis of quantitative properties of computation. This would help to improve the understanding on existing systems. More importantly, unifying frameworks can be used *themselves* as a foundation for controlling the use of resources inside programming languages.

In this paper, we introduce a new semantical framework which consists of an innovative modification of realizability. The main idea underlying our proposal lies in considering bounded-time algorithms as realizers instead of taking plain Turing Machines as is usually the case in realizability constructions. Bounds are expressed abstractly as elements of a monoid. We can define a model for a given (logical or type) system by choosing a monoid flexible enough to justify all the constructs in the system. The model can then be used to study the class of representable functions.

This allows us to give new proofs of soundness (all representable functions on base types lies in certain complexity classes) for Light Affine Logic (**LAL**, [1]), Elementary Affine Logic (**EAL**, [5]), **LFPL** [8] and Soft Affine Logic (**SAL**, [2]). While being the first entirely semantical proof of polytime soundness for light logics, our proof also provides a notable simplification of the original already semantical proof of polytime soundness for **LFPL** [8]. A new result made possible by the semantic framework is the addition of polymorphism and a modality to **LFPL**.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe an abstract computational model that will be used in the rest of the paper. In Section 3 we introduce length spaces and show

*Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Informazione, Università di Bologna. dallago@cs.unibo.it

†Institut für Informatik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München. mhofmann@informatik.uni-muenchen.de

they can be used to interpret multiplicative linear logic with free weakening. Sections 4, 5 and 6 are devoted to present instances of the framework together with soundness results for elementary, soft and light affine logics. Section 7 presents a further specialization of length spaces and a new soundness theorem for LFPL based on it.

Related-Work Realizability has been used in connection with resource-bounded computation in several places. The most prominent is Cook and Urquhart work [4], where terms of a language called PV^ω are used to realize formulas of bounded arithmetic. The contribution of that paper is related to ours in that realizability is used to show “polytime soundness” of a logic. There are important differences though. First, realizers in Cook and Urquhart [4] are typed and very closely related to the logic that is being realized. Second, the language of realizers PV^ω only contains first order recursion and is therefore useless for systems like LFPL or LAL. In contrast, we use untyped realizers and interpret types as certain partial equivalence relations on those. This links our work to the untyped realizability model HEO (due to Kreisel [11]). This, in turn, has also been done by Crossley et al. [6]. There, however, one proves externally that untyped realizers (in this case of bounded arithmetic formulas) are polytime. In our work, and this happens for the first time, the untyped realizers are used to give meaning to the logic and obtain polytime soundness as a corollary. Thus, certain resource bounds are built into the untyped realizers by their very construction. Such a thing is not at all obvious, because untyped universes of realizers tend to be Turing complete from the beginning to due definability of fixed-point combinators. We get around this problem through our notion of a resource monoid and addition of a certain time bound to Kleene applications of realizers. Indeed, we consider this as the main innovation of our paper and hope it to be useful elsewhere.

2 A Computational Model

In this paper, we rely on an abstract computational framework rather than a concrete one like Turing Machines. This, in particular, will simplify proofs.

Let $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be the set of finite sequences over the alphabet Σ . We assume a pairing function $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : L \times L \rightarrow L$ and a length function $|\cdot| : L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\langle x, y \rangle| = |x| + |y| + cp$ and $|x| \leq \text{length}(x)$, where $\text{length}(x)$ is the number of symbols in x and cp is a fixed constant. We assume a reasonable encoding of algorithms as elements of L . We write $\{e\}(x)$ for the (possibly undefined) application of algorithm $e \in L$ to input $x \in L$. We furthermore assume an abstract time measure $\text{Time}(\{e\}(x)) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{Time}(\{e\}(x))$ is defined whenever $\{e\}(x)$ is and, moreover

- $\{e\}(x)$ can be evaluated on a Turing machine in time bounded by $p(\text{Time}(\{e\}(x)) + |e| + |x|)$, where $p : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed polynomial.
- For each Turing machine M running in time $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there is $e \in L$ so that $\{e\}(\Phi(x)) = \Phi(y)$, (where y is the result of running M on input x). Furthermore, $\text{Time}(\{e\}(\Phi(x))) = O(f(|x|))$.
- $B = \{0, 1\}^*$ can be embedded into L by a map $\Phi : B \rightarrow L$ such that both Φ and Φ^{-1} can be computed in polynomial time.
- There are $e_0, e_1 \in L$ such that for every $x \in B$, $\{e_0\}(\Phi(x)) = \Phi(0x)$, $\{e_1\}(\Phi(x)) = \Phi(1x)$. Moreover, $\text{Time}(\{e_0\}(x)) = \text{Time}(\{e_1\}(x)) = O(1)$.
- There is e_{comp} (composition) such that for every x, y it holds that $\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle) = z$ where $|z| = |x| + |y| + O(1)$ and $\{z\}(w) = \{y\}(\{x\}(w))$; moreover, $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) = O(1)$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(w)) = \text{Time}(\{x\}(w)) + \text{Time}(\{y\}(\{x\}(w))) + O(1)$.
- There is e_{id} (identity) such that $\{e_{\text{id}}\}(x) = x$ for every x and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{id}}\}(x)) = O(1)$.
- For every $x \in L$ there is e_{const}^x such that $\{e_{\text{const}}^x\}(y) = x$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{const}}^x\}(y)) = O(1)$.
- For every $x \in L$ there is $e_{\text{tensconst}}^x$ such that $\{e_{\text{tensconst}}^x\}(y) = \langle y, x \rangle$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{tensconst}}^x\}(y)) = O(1)$.
- There is $e_{\text{throwfirst}}$ such that for every $x \in L$ $\{e_{\text{throwfirst}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle) = y$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{throwfirst}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) = O(1)$.
- There is e_{swap} (swapping) such that $\{e_{\text{swap}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle) = \langle y, x \rangle$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{swap}}\}(z)) \leq O(1)$.

- There is e_{tens} (tensor) such that for every x $\{e_{tens}\}(x) = y$ where $|y| = |x| + O(1)$ and $\{y\}(\langle z, w \rangle) = \langle \{x\}(z), w \rangle$; moreover, $Time(\{e_{tens}\}(x)) = O(1)$ and $Time(\{y\}(\langle z, w \rangle)) = Time(\{x\}(z)) + O(1)$.
- There is e_{assl} (rebracketing) such that $\{e_{assl}\}(\langle x, \langle y, z \rangle \rangle) = \langle \langle x, y \rangle, z \rangle$ and $Time(\{e_{assl}\}(x)) = O(1)$.
- There is e_{contr} (duplication, copying) such that $\{e_{contr}\}(x) = \langle x, x \rangle$ and $Time(\{e_{contr}\}(x)) = O(|x|)$.
- There is e_{eval} (application) such that $\{e_{eval}\}(\langle x, y \rangle) = \{x\}(y)$ and $Time(\{e_{eval}\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) = Time(\{x\}(y)) + O(1)$.
- There is e_{curry} (currying, “smn-theorem”) such that, for each x , $y = \{e_{curry}\}(x)$ exists and satisfies $|y| = |x| + O(1)$ and $Time(\{e_{curry}\}(x)) = O(1)$; moreover, for every z , $c_z = \{y\}(z)$ exists and satisfies $|c_z| = |y| + |z| + O(1)$ and $Time(\{y\}(z)) = O(1)$; finally, for every w , $\{c_z\}(w) = \{x\}(\langle z, w \rangle)$ and $Time(\{c_z\}(w)) = Time(\{x\}(\langle z, w \rangle)) + O(1)$.

There are a number of ways to instantiate this framework. One noticeable and simple way consists in using call-by-value lambda calculus and is described in the following. Σ will be $\{\lambda, @, 0, 1, \blacktriangleright\}$. To any lambda term $M \in \Lambda$, we can associate a string $M^\# \in \Sigma^*$ in the obvious way. For example, if $M \equiv (\lambda x. xy)(\lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. x)$, then $M^\#$ is

$$@ \lambda @ \blacktriangleright 0 \blacktriangleright \lambda \lambda \lambda \blacktriangleright 10$$

In other words, free occurrences of variables are translated into $\blacktriangleright$, while bounded occurrences of variables are translated into $\blacktriangleright s$, where s is the binary representation of the deBruijn index for the occurrence. L will just be the set of strings in Σ^* corresponding to lambda terms via the mapping we just described. In the following, we will often write a lambda-term in the usual notation, but this is just syntactic sugar for the corresponding element of L . The abstract length $|s|$ of $s \in L$ is just $length(s)$. The map $\Phi : B \rightarrow L$ is defined by induction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\varepsilon) &= \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. z \\ \Phi(0s) &= \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. x \Phi(s) \\ \Phi(1s) &= \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. y \Phi(s) \end{aligned}$$

Given $M, N \in \Lambda$, consider the following definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M, N \rangle &\equiv \lambda x. x M N \\ M_0 &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. \lambda w. y x \\ M_1 &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. \lambda w. z x \\ M_{comp} &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. x(yz) \\ M_{id} &\equiv \lambda x. x \\ M_{const}^N &\equiv \lambda x. N \\ M_{tensconst}^N &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. y x M \\ M_{throwfirst} &\equiv \lambda x. x(\lambda y. \lambda z. z) \\ M_{swap} &\equiv \lambda x. x(\lambda y. \lambda w. \lambda z. z w y) \\ M_{tens} &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. y(\lambda z. \lambda q. (\lambda y. \lambda w. w y q)(x z)) \\ M_{assl} &\equiv \lambda x. x(\lambda y. \lambda w. w(\lambda z. \lambda q. \lambda r. r(\lambda s. s y z) q)) \\ M_{contr} &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. y x x \\ M_{eval} &\equiv \lambda x. x(\lambda y. \lambda w. y w) \\ M_{curry} &\equiv \lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda w. x(\lambda z. z y w) \end{aligned}$$

Values are abstractions and variables. We consider call-by-value reduction on lambda terms, i.e. we take $\rightarrow$ as the closure of

$$(\lambda x. M)V \rightarrow M\{x/V\}$$

under all applicative contexts. The application $\{M\}(N)$ of two lambda terms is the normal form of MN relative to the call-by-value reduction (if one exists). We now define a (ternary) relation $\rightarrow \subseteq \Lambda \times \mathbb{N} \times \Lambda$. In the following, we will write $M \xrightarrow{n} N$ standing for $(M, n, N) \in \rightarrow$. The precise definition of $\rightarrow$ (in SOS-style) follows:

$$\frac{}{M \xrightarrow{0} M} \quad \frac{M \rightarrow N \quad n = \max\{1, |N| - |M|\}}{M \xrightarrow{n} N} \quad \frac{M \xrightarrow{n} N \quad N \xrightarrow{m} L}{M \xrightarrow{n+m} L}$$

It turns out that for every M, N such that L is the normal form of MN , there is exactly one integer n such that $MN \xrightarrow{n} L$. So, defining $Time(\{M\}(N))$ to be just n is unambiguous. All the axioms listed at the beginning of this section can be proved to be satisfied by this calculus.

3 Length Spaces

In this section, we introduce the category of length spaces and study its properties. Lengths will not necessarily be numbers but rather elements of a commutative monoid.

A *resource monoid* is a quadruple $M = (|M|, +, \leq_M, \mathcal{D}_M)$ where

- (i) $(|M|, +)$ is a commutative monoid;
- (ii) $\leq_M$ is a pre-order on $|M|$ which is compatible with $+$;
- (iii) $\mathcal{D}_M : \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid \alpha \leq_M \beta\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a function such that for every α, β, γ

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \beta) + \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \gamma) &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \gamma) \\ \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \beta) &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha + \gamma, \beta + \gamma) \end{aligned}$$

and, moreover, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is α such that $\mathcal{D}_M(0, \alpha) \geq n$.

Given a resource monoid $M = (|M|, +, \leq_M, \mathcal{D}_M)$, the function $\mathcal{F}_M : |M| \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by putting $\mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) = \mathcal{D}_M(0, \alpha)$. We abbreviate $\sigma + \dots + \sigma$ (n times) as $n \cdot \sigma$.

Let us try to give some intuition about these axioms. We shall use elements of a resource monoid to bound data, algorithms, and runtimes in the following way: an element φ bounds an algorithm e if $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi) \geq |e|$ and, more importantly, whenever α bounds an input x to e then there must be a bound $\beta \leq_M \varphi + \alpha$ for the result $y = \{e\}(x)$ and, most importantly, the runtime of that computation must be bounded by $\mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \varphi + \alpha)$. So, in a sense, we have the option of either producing a large output fast or to take a long time for a small output. The “inverse triangular” law above ensures that the composition of two algorithms bounded by φ_1 and φ_2 , respectively, can be bounded by $\varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ or a simple modification thereof. In particular, the contribution of the unknown intermediate result in a composition cancels out using that law. Another useful intuition is that $\mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \beta)$ behaves like the difference $\beta - \alpha$, indeed, $(\beta - \alpha) + (\gamma - \beta) \leq \gamma - \alpha$.

Lemma 1 *If M is a resource monoid, then $\mathcal{D}_M$ is antitone on its first argument and monotone on its second argument.*

Proof. If $\alpha \leq_M \beta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \gamma) &\geq \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \beta) + \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \gamma) \geq \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \gamma); \\ \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \alpha) &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \alpha) + \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \beta) \geq \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

A *length space* on a resource monoid $M = (|M|, +, \leq_M, \mathcal{D}_M)$ is a pair $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$, where $|A|$ is a set and $\Vdash_A \subseteq |M| \times L \times |A|$ is a (infix) relation satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) If $\alpha, e \Vdash_A a$, then $\mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) \geq |e|$;
- (ii) For every $a \in |A|$, there are α, e such that $\alpha, e \Vdash_A a$;
- (iii) If $\alpha, e \Vdash_A a$ and $\alpha \leq_M \beta$, then $\beta, e \Vdash_A a$;
- (iv) If $\alpha, e \Vdash_A a$ and $\alpha, e \Vdash_A b$, then $a = b$.

The last requirement implies that each element of $|A|$ is uniquely determined by the (nonempty) set of its realisers and in particular limits the cardinality of any length space to the number of partial equivalence relations on L .

A *morphism* from length space $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$ to length space $B = (|B|, \Vdash_B)$ (on the same resource monoid $M = (|M|, +, \leq_M, \mathcal{D}_M)$) is a function $f : |A| \rightarrow |B|$ such that there exist $e \in L = \Sigma^*$, $\varphi \in |M|$ with $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi) \geq |e|$ and whenever $\alpha, d \Vdash_A a$, there must be β, c such that

- (i) $\beta, c \Vdash_B f(a)$;
- (ii) $\beta \leq_M \varphi + \alpha$;
- (iii) $\{e\}(d) = c$;
- (iv) $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \varphi + \alpha)$

We call e a realizer of f and φ a majorizer of f . The set of all morphisms from A to B is denoted as $\text{Hom}(A, B)$. If f is a morphism from A to B realized by e and majorized by φ , then we will write $f : A \xrightarrow{e, \varphi} B$ or $\varphi, e \Vdash_{A \multimap B} f$.

Remark 1 *It is possible to alter the time bound in the definition of a morphism to $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \varphi + \alpha) \mathcal{F}_M(\alpha + \varphi)$. This allows one to accommodate linear time operations by padding the majorizer for the morphism. All the subsequent proofs go through with this alternative definition, at the expense of simplicity and ease of presentation,*

Given two length spaces $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$ and $B = (|B|, \Vdash_B)$ on the same resource monoid M , we can build $A \otimes B = (|A| \times |B|, \Vdash_{A \otimes B})$ (on M) where $e, \alpha \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$ iff $\mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) \geq |e|$ and there are f, g, β, γ with

$$\begin{aligned} f, \beta &\Vdash_A a \\ g, \gamma &\Vdash_B b \\ e &= \langle f, g \rangle \\ \alpha &\geq_M \beta + \gamma \end{aligned}$$

$A \otimes B$ is a well-defined length space due to the axioms on M .

Given A and B as above, we can build $A \multimap B = (\text{Hom}(A, B), \Vdash_{A \multimap B})$ where $e, \alpha \Vdash_{A \multimap B} f$ iff f is a morphism from A to B realized by e and majorized by α .

Morphisms can be composed:

Lemma 2 (Composition) *Given length spaces A, B, C , there is a morphism*

$$\text{comp} : (B \multimap C) \otimes (A \multimap B) \rightarrow (A \multimap C)$$

such that $\text{comp}(f, g) = \lambda x. f(g(x))$.

Proof. Let $f : A \xrightarrow{x, \varphi} B$ and $g : B \xrightarrow{y, \psi} C$. We know there are constants p, q, r such that $\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle) = z$ where $|z| \leq |x| + |y| + p$ and $\{z\}(w) = \{y\}(\{x\}(w))$; moreover, $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) \leq r$ and $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{comp}}\}(w)) = \text{Time}(\{x\}(w)) + \text{Time}(\{y\}(\{x\}(w))) + q$. Now, let us now choose μ such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\mu) \geq p + q$. We will prove that $\text{comp}(f, g) : A \xrightarrow{z, \varphi + \psi + \mu} C$. Obviously, $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi + \psi + \mu) \geq |z|$. If $\alpha, w \Vdash_A a$, then there must be β, t such that $\beta, t \Vdash_B f(a)$ and the other conditions prescribed by the definition of a morphism hold. Moreover, there must be γ, s such that $\gamma, s \Vdash_C g(f(a))$ and, again, the other conditions are satisfied. Putting them together, we get:

$$\gamma \leq_M \beta + \psi \leq_M \alpha + \varphi + \psi \leq_M \alpha + \varphi + \psi + \mu$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{z\}(w)) &\leq \text{Time}(\{x\}(w)) + \text{Time}(\{y\}(t)) + q \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\beta, \alpha + \varphi) + \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \beta + \psi) + \mathcal{F}_M(\mu) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\beta + \psi, \alpha + \varphi + \psi) + \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \beta + \psi) + \mathcal{D}_M(0, \mu) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma, \alpha + \varphi + \psi + \mu) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof, since $\text{comp} : (B \multimap C) \otimes (A \multimap B) \xrightarrow{(f, g), \xi} A \multimap C$ where ξ is such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\xi) \geq r + |e_{\text{comp}}|$. $\square$

Basic morphisms can be built independently on the underlying resource monoid. Noticeably, they correspond to axiom of multiplicative linear logic:

Lemma 3 (Basic Maps) *Given length spaces A, B, C , there are morphisms:*

$$\begin{aligned} id & : A \rightarrow A \\ swap & : A \otimes B \rightarrow B \otimes A \\ assl & : A \otimes (B \otimes C) \rightarrow (A \otimes B) \otimes C \\ eval & : A \otimes (A \multimap B) \rightarrow B \\ curry & : ((A \otimes B) \multimap C) \rightarrow A \multimap (B \multimap C) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} id(a) & = a \\ swap(a, b) & = (b, a) \\ assl(a, (b, c)) & = ((a, b), c) \\ eval(a, f) & = f(a) \\ curry(f) & = \lambda a. \lambda b. f(a, b) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We know that $\{e_{id}\}(d)$ takes constant time, say at most p . Then, let $\varphi_{id} \in M$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{id}) \geq p + |e_{id}|$ (this can always be done). Now, let $\alpha, d \Vdash_A a$. We have that $\alpha, d \Vdash_A id(a)$, $\alpha \leq_M \alpha + \varphi_{id}$, $\{e_{id}\}(d) = d$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} Time(\{e_{id}\}(d)) & \leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{id}) = \mathcal{D}_M(0, \varphi_{id}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \alpha + \varphi_{id}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves id to be a morphism.

We know that $\{e_{swap}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)$ takes constant time, say at most p . Then, let $\varphi_{swap} \in |M|$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{id}) \geq p + |e_{swap}|$. Now, let $\alpha, e \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$. This is that $e = \langle d, c \rangle$ and $\alpha, \langle c, d \rangle \Vdash_{B \otimes A} (b, a)$. We can then apply the same argument as for id . In particular:

$$\begin{aligned} Time(\{e_{swap}\}(e)) & \leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{swap}) = \mathcal{D}_M(0, \varphi_{swap}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\alpha, \alpha + \varphi_{swap}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves $swap$ to be a morphism. We can verify $assl$ to be a morphism exactly in the same way.

We know that $\{e_{eval}\}(\langle d, c \rangle) = \{d\}(c)$ and $\{e_{eval}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)$ takes constant overload time, say at most p . φ_{eval} is chosen as to satisfy $\mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{eval}) \geq p$. Let now $\alpha, e \Vdash_{A \otimes (A \multimap B)} (a, f)$. This means that $e = \langle d, c \rangle$ and there are β and γ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta, d & \Vdash_A a \\ \gamma, c & \Vdash_{A \multimap B} f \\ \alpha & \geq_M \beta + \gamma \\ \mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) & \geq \mathcal{F}_M(\beta) + \mathcal{F}_M(\gamma) + cp \end{aligned}$$

From $\gamma, c \Vdash_{A \multimap B} f$ it follows that, by the definition of a morphism, there must be δ, h such that

- (i) $\delta, h \Vdash_B f(a)$
- (ii) $\delta \leq_M \beta + \gamma$
- (iii) $\{c\}(d) = h$
- (iv) $Time(\{c\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \beta + \gamma)$

From $\delta \leq_M \beta + \gamma$ and $\beta + \gamma \leq_M \alpha$, it follows that $\delta \leq_M \alpha \leq_M \alpha + \mu$. Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} Time(\{e_{eval}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)) & \leq p + Time(\{c\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{eval}) + \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \beta + \gamma) \\ & \leq \mathcal{F}_M(\varphi_{eval}) + \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \beta + \gamma) + \mathcal{D}_M(\beta + \gamma, \alpha) \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_M(0, \varphi_{eval}) + \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \alpha) \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \alpha + \varphi_{eval}) \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us prove that *curry* is a morphism. First of all, we know there must be constants p, q, r, s, t such that, for each e, x, y , there are d and c_x with

$$\begin{aligned}
Time(\{e_{curry}\}(e)) &\leq p \\
d &= \{e_{curry}\}(e) \\
|d| &\leq |e| + q \\
Time(\{d\}(x)) &\leq r \\
c_x &= \{d\}(x) \\
|c_x| &\leq |e| + |x| + s \\
Time(\{c_x\}(y)) &\leq Time(\{e\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) + t \\
\{e\}(\langle x, y \rangle) &= \{c_x\}(y)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mu, \theta, \xi \in |M|$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_M(\xi) &\geq p \\
\mathcal{F}_M(\mu) &\geq q \\
\mathcal{F}_M(\sigma) &\geq r \\
\mathcal{F}_M(\theta) &\geq s \\
\mathcal{F}_M(\eta) &\geq t \\
\mathcal{F}_M(\chi) &\geq cp
\end{aligned}$$

Let now $\gamma, e \Vdash_{A \otimes B \multimap C} f$. We know that $|d| \leq |e| + q$ and $Time(\{e_{curry}\}(e)) \leq p$. In order to prove that *curry* is indeed a morphism realized by e_{curry} and majorized by $\mu + \xi + \sigma + \theta + \chi + \eta$, it then suffices to prove that

$$\gamma + \mu + \sigma + \theta + \chi + \theta, d \Vdash_{A \multimap B \multimap C} \lambda a. \lambda b. f(a, b).$$

Let then $\alpha, x \Vdash_A a$. There is c_x such that $c_x = \{d\}(x)$, $|c_x| \leq |e| + |x| + s$ and $Time(\{d\}(x)) \leq r$. In order to prove that $\lambda a. \lambda b. f(a, b)$ is indeed a morphism realized by d and majorized by $\gamma + \mu + \sigma + \theta + \chi + \eta$, it then suffices to prove that $\gamma + \alpha + \mu + \theta + \chi + \eta, c_x \Vdash_{B \multimap C} \lambda b. f(a, b)$. Let then $\beta, y \Vdash_B b$. There are δ, c such $\delta, c \Vdash_C f(a, b)$, where $\delta \leq \alpha + \beta + \chi + \gamma$. Moreover, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
Time(\{c_x\}(y)) &\leq Time(\{e\}(\langle x, y \rangle)) + t \leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \alpha + \beta + \chi + \gamma) + t \\
&\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \chi) + \mathcal{D}_M(0, \eta + \mu + \theta) \\
&\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \chi + \eta + \mu + \theta)
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □.

Length spaces can justify the usual rule for tensor as a map-former:

Lemma 4 (Tensor) *Given length spaces A, B, C , there is a morphism*

$$tens : (A \multimap B) \rightarrow ((A \otimes C) \multimap (B \otimes C))$$

where $tens(f) = \lambda x. (f(\pi_1(x)), \pi_2(x))$.

Proof. Let $f : A \xrightarrow{x, \varphi} B$. We know there are constants p, q such that $\{e_{tens}\}(x) = y$ where $|y| \leq |x| + p$ and $\{y\}(\langle z, w \rangle) = \langle \{x\}(z), w \rangle$; moreover, $Time(\{e_{tens}\}(x)) \leq q$ and $Time(\{y\}(\langle z, w \rangle)) \leq Time(\{x\}(z)) + r$. Then, take $\psi \in |M|$ such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\psi) \geq p + r$, put $\sigma = \psi + \varphi + \mu$, where $\mathcal{F}_M(\mu) \geq cp$. Suppose $\alpha, \langle z, w \rangle \Vdash_{A \otimes C} (a, c)$. By definition, there are β, γ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta, z &\Vdash_A a \\
\gamma, w &\Vdash_C c \\
\alpha &\geq_M \beta + \gamma
\end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, there are δ, t such that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta, t &\Vdash_B f(a) \\ \delta &\leq_M \varphi + \beta \\ \{e\}(z) &= t \\ \text{Time}(\{e\}(z)) &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \varphi + \beta) \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\gamma + \delta + \mu, \langle t, w \rangle \Vdash_{B \otimes C} (f(a), c)$. Moreover,

$$\gamma + \delta + \mu \leq_M \gamma + \varphi + \beta + \mu \leq_M \alpha + \varphi + \mu \leq_M \alpha + \sigma$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{y\}(\langle z, w \rangle)) &\leq \text{Time}(\{x\}(z)) + r \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \varphi + \beta) + \mathcal{F}_M(\psi) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\delta, \varphi + \beta + \psi) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma + \delta + \mu, \gamma + \varphi + \beta + \mu + \psi) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma + \delta + \mu, \gamma + \beta + \sigma) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_M(\gamma + \delta + \mu, \alpha + \sigma) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof, since $\text{tens} : (A \multimap B) \xrightarrow{(f,g), \xi} (A \otimes C) \multimap (B \otimes C)$ where ξ is such that $\mathcal{F}_M(\xi) \geq q + |e_{\text{tens}}|$. $\square$

Thus:

Lemma 5 *Length spaces and their morphisms form a symmetric monoidal closed category with tensor and linear implication given as above.*

A length space I is defined by $|I| = \{0\}$ and $\alpha, e \Vdash_A 0$ when $\mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) \geq |e|$. For each length space A there are isomorphisms $A \otimes I \simeq A$ and a unique morphism $A \rightarrow I$. The latter serves to justify full weakening.

For every resource monoid M , there is a length space $B_M = (\{0, 1\}^*, \Vdash_{B_M})$ where $\alpha, \Phi(t) \Vdash_{B_M} t$ whenever $\mathcal{F}_M(\alpha) \geq |t|$. The function s_0 (respectively, s_1) from $\{0, 1\}^*$ to itself which appends 0 (respectively, 1) to the left of its argument can be computed in constant time on the abstract computational model and, as a consequence, is a morphism from B_M to itself.

3.1 Interpreting Multiplicative Affine Logic

We can now formally show that second order multiplicative affine logic (i.e. multiplicative linear logic plus full weakening) can be interpreted inside the category of length spaces on any monoid M . Doing this will simplify the analysis of richer systems presented in following sections. Formulae of (intuitionistic) multiplicative affine logic are generated by the following productions:

$$A ::= \alpha \mid A \multimap A \mid A \otimes A \mid \forall \alpha. A$$

where α ranges over a countable set of atoms. Rules are reported in figure 1. A *realizability environment* is a partial function assigning length spaces (on the same resource monoid) to atoms. Realizability semantics $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}}$ of a formula A on the realizability environment η is defined by induction on A :

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} &= \eta(\alpha) \\ \llbracket A \otimes B \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} &= \llbracket A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes \llbracket B \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} \\ \llbracket A \multimap B \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} &= \llbracket A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} \multimap \llbracket B \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} \\ \llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} &= (\llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}}, \Vdash_{\llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}}}) \end{aligned}$$

Identity, Cut and Weakening.

$$\frac{}{A \vdash A} I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} U \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma, B \vdash A} W$$

Multiplicative Logical Rules.

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, A \otimes B \vdash C} L_{\otimes} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \otimes B} R_{\otimes} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta, A \multimap B \vdash C} L_{\multimap} \quad \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B} R_{\multimap}$$

Second Order Logical Rules.

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, A[C/\alpha] \vdash B}{\Gamma, \forall \alpha. A \vdash B} L^{\forall} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \alpha \notin FV(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \forall \alpha. A} R^{\forall}$$

Figure 1: Intuitionistic Multiplicative Affine Logic

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{U}}| &= \prod_{C \in \mathcal{U}} |\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\eta[\alpha \mapsto C]}^{\mathcal{U}}| \\ \alpha, e \Vdash_{\llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{U}}} a &\iff \forall C. \alpha, e \Vdash_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\eta[\alpha \mapsto C]}^{\mathcal{U}}} a \end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{U}$ stands for the class of all length spaces. A little care is needed when defining the product since strictly speaking it does not exist for size reasons. The standard way out is to let the product range over those length spaces whose underlying set equals the set of equivalence classes of a partial equivalence relation on L . As already mentioned, every length space is isomorphic to one such. When working with the product one has to insert these isomorphisms in appropriate places which, however, we elide to increase readability.

If $n \geq 0$ and $A_1, \dots, A_n$ are formulas, the expression $\llbracket A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{U}}$ stands for I if $n = 0$ and $\llbracket A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_{n-1} \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \llbracket A_n \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{U}}$ if $n \geq 1$.

4 Elementary Length Spaces

In this section, we define a resource monoid $\mathcal{L}$ such that elementary affine logic can be interpreted in the category of length spaces on $\mathcal{L}$. We then (re)prove that functions representable in EAL are elementary time computable.

A *list* is either *empty* or *cons*(n, l) where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and l is itself a list. The sum $l + h$ of two lists l and h is defined as follows, by induction on l :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{empty} + h &= h + \text{empty} = h \\ \text{cons}(n, l) + \text{cons}(m, h) &= \text{cons}(n + m, l + h) \end{aligned}$$

For every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, binary relations $\leq_e$ on lists can be defined as follows

- $\text{empty} \leq_e l$;
- $\text{cons}(n, l) \leq_e \text{cons}(m, h)$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 - (i) $n \leq 3^e(m + e) - d$;
 - (ii) $l \leq_d h$.

For every e and for every lists l and h with $l \leq_e h$, we define the natural number $\mathcal{D}_e(l, h)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) &= 0; \\ \mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, \text{cons}(n, l)) &= 3^e(n + e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)}(\text{empty}, l); \\ \mathcal{D}_e(\text{cons}(n, l), \text{cons}(m, h)) &= 3^e(m + e) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)-n}(l, h); \end{aligned}$$

Given a list l , $!l$ stands for the list $\text{cons}(0, l)$. The depth $\text{depth}(l)$ of a list l is defined by induction on l : $\text{depth}(\text{empty}) = 0$ while $\text{depth}(\text{cons}(n, l)) = \text{depth}(l) + 1$. $|l|$ stands for the maximum integer appearing inside l , i.e. $|\text{empty}| = 0$ and $|\text{cons}(n, l)| = \max\{n, |l|\}$. For every natural number n , $[n]_{\mathcal{L}}$ stands for $\text{cons}(n, \text{empty})$.

We can now verify that all the necessary conditions required by the definition of a resource monoid are satisfied. To do this, we need a number of preliminary results, which can all be proved by simple inductions and case-analysis:

Lemma 6 (Compatibility) *$\text{empty} \leq_e l$ for every l . Moreover, if l, h, j are lists and $l \leq_e h$, then $l + j \leq_e h + j$.*

Proof. The first claim is trivial. To prove the second, we proceed by an induction on j . If $j = \text{empty}$, then $l + j = l \leq_e h = h + j$. Now, suppose $j = \text{cons}(n, g)$. If $h = \text{empty}$, then $l = \text{empty}$ and, clearly $l + j = j \leq_e j = h + j$. If $l = \text{empty}$, we have to prove that $j \leq_e h + j$. Let $h = \text{cons}(m, f)$; then

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq n + m \leq 3^e(n + m + e) - 0 \\ g &\leq_0 g + f \end{aligned}$$

which means $j \leq_e h + j$. Finally, suppose $l = \text{cons}(m, f)$, $h = \text{cons}(p, r)$. Then we know that

$$\begin{aligned} m &\leq 3^e(p + e) - d \\ f &\leq_d r \end{aligned}$$

But then, by inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} m + n &\leq 3^e(p + e) + n - d \leq 3^e(p + n + e) - d \\ f + g &\leq_d r + g \end{aligned}$$

which yields $l + j \leq_e h + j$. □

Lemma 7 (Transitivity) *If l, h, j are lists and $l \leq_e h$, $h \leq_d j$, then $l \leq_{d+e} j$.*

Proof. We can suppose all the involved lists to be different from empty , since all the other cases are trivial. $l = \text{cons}(n, g)$, $h = \text{cons}(m, f)$ and $j = \text{cons}(p, r)$. From the hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq 3^e(m + e) - c \\ m &\leq 3^d(p + d) - b \\ g &\leq_c f \\ f &\leq_b r \end{aligned}$$

But then, by inductive hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq 3^e(m + e) - c \leq 3^e(3^d(p + d) - b + e) - c \leq 3^e 3^d(p + d + e) - b - c = 3^{e+d}(p + d + e) - (b + c) \\ g &\leq_{c+b} r \end{aligned}$$

This means $l \leq_{d+e} j$. □

Lemma 8 *if l, h, j are lists and $l \leq_e h$, then $\mathcal{D}_e(l, h) \leq \mathcal{D}_e(l + j, h + j)$*

Proof. We proceed by an induction on j . If $j = \text{empty}$, then $l + j = l$ and $h + j = h$. Now, suppose $j = \text{cons}(n, g)$. If $h = \text{empty}$, then $l = \text{empty}$ and, clearly $l + j = j = h + j$. If $l = \text{empty}$, let $h = \text{cons}(m, f)$; then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_e(l, h) &= \mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, h) = 3^e(m + e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)}(\text{empty}, f) \\ &\leq 3^e(m + e) + 3^e n - 3^e n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)+3^e n-3^e n}(g, g + f) \\ &\leq 3^e(m + n + e) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+n+e)-n}(g, g + f) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_e(j, h + j) = \mathcal{D}_e(l + j, h + j) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, suppose $l = \text{cons}(m, f)$, $h = \text{cons}(p, r)$. Then we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_e(l, h) &= 3^e(m+e) - p + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)-p}(f, r) \\
&\leq 3^e(m+e) - p + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)-p}(f+g, r+g) \\
&\leq 3^e(m+e) + 3^en - (n+p) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+e)+3^en-n-p}(f+g, r+g) \\
&= 3^e(m+n+e) - (n+p) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+n+e)-(n+p)}(f+g, r+g) \\
&= \mathcal{D}_e(l+j, h+j)
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9 *If l, h, j are lists and $l \leq_e h$, $h \leq_d j$, then $\mathcal{D}_e(l, h) + \mathcal{D}_d(h, j) \leq \mathcal{D}_{e+d}(l, j)$.*

Proof. If either $h = \text{empty}$ or $j = \text{empty}$, then the thesis is trivial. So suppose $h = \text{cons}(n, g)$ and $j = \text{cons}(m, f)$. If $l = \text{empty}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_e(l, h) + \mathcal{D}_d(h, j) &= 3^e(n+e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)}(\text{empty}, g) + 3^d(m+d) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(m+d)-n}(g, f) \\
&\leq 3^e(n+e) + 3^d(m+d) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)+3^d(m+d)-n}(\text{empty}, f) \\
&\leq (3^e - 1)n + 3^ee + 3^d(m+d) + \mathcal{D}_{(3^e-1)n+3^ee+3^d(m+d)}(\text{empty}, f) \\
&\leq (3^e - 1)3^d(m+d) + 3^ee + 3^d(m+d) + \mathcal{D}_{(3^e-1)3^d(m+d)+3^ee+3^d(m+d)}(\text{empty}, f) \\
&= 3^{d+e}(m+d+e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^{d+e}(m+d+e)}(\text{empty}, f) \\
&= \mathcal{D}_{e+d}(l, j)
\end{aligned}$$

If $l = \text{cons}(p, r)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_e(l, h) + \mathcal{D}_d(h, j) &= 3^e(n+e) - p + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)-p}(r, g) + 3^d(m+d) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^d(m+d)-n}(g, f) \\
&\leq 3^e(n+e) - p + 3^d(m+d) - n + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)-p+3^d(m+d)-n}(r, f) \\
&\leq (3^e - 1)n + 3^ee + 3^d(m+d) - p + \mathcal{D}_{(3^e-1)n+3^ee+3^d(m+d)-p}(r, f) \\
&\leq (3^e - 1)3^d(m+d) + 3^ee + 3^d(m+d) - p + \mathcal{D}_{(3^e-1)3^d(m+d)+3^ee+3^d(m+d)-p}(r, f) \\
&= 3^{d+e}(m+d+e) - p + \mathcal{D}_{3^{d+e}(m+d+e)-p}(r, f) \\
&= \mathcal{D}_{e+d}(l, j)
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

$|\mathcal{L}|$ will denote the set of all lists, while $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$ will denote $\leq_0$ and $\mathcal{D}_0$, respectively.

Lemma 10 $\mathcal{L} = (|\mathcal{L}|, +, \leq_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}})$ is a resource monoid.

Proof. $(\mathcal{L}, +)$ is certainly a monoid. Compatibility of $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}$ follows from lemmas 6 and 7. The two required property on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}$ come directly from lemmas 8 and 9. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, observe that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(\text{cons}(n, \text{empty})) = n$. This concludes the proof. $\square$

An *elementary length space* is a length space on the resource monoid $(|\mathcal{L}|, +, \leq_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}})$. Given an elementary length space $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$, we can build the length space $!A = (|A|, \Vdash_{!A})$, where $l, e \Vdash_{!A} a$ iff $h, e \Vdash_A a$ and $l \geq_{\mathcal{L}} !h$. The construction $!$ on elementary length spaces serves to capture the exponential modality of elementary affine logic. Indeed, the following two results prove the existence of morphisms and morphisms-forming rules precisely corresponding to axioms and rules from EAL.

Lemma 11 *For every $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $l \in \mathcal{L}$, $l + l \leq_1 l$ and $\mathcal{D}_{e+1}(l + l, l) \geq \mathcal{D}_e(0, l)$.*

Proof. The inequality $l + l \leq_1 l$ can be proved by induction on l . The base case is trivial. If $l = \text{cons}(n, h)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
n + n &\leq 3n + 3 - 1 = 3^1(n + 1) - 1 \\
h + h &\leq_1 h
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality can be proved by induction on l , too. The base case is trivial. If $l = \text{cons}(n, h)$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{e+1}(l + l, l) &= 3^{e+1}(n + e + 1) - 2n + \mathcal{D}_{3^{e+1}(n+e+1)-2n}(h + h, h) \\ \mathcal{D}_e(0, l) &= 3^e(n + e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)}(0, h)\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}3^{e+1}(n + e + 1) - 2n &= 3^e(n + e + 1) + 2(3^e)(n + e + 1) - 2n \\ &\geq 3^e(n + e + 1) + 2n - 2n \geq 3^e(n + e) + 1\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 12 (Basic Maps) *Given elementary length spaces A, B , there are morphisms:*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{contr} &: !A \rightarrow !A \otimes !A \\ \text{distr} &: !A \otimes !B \rightarrow !(A \otimes B)\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{contr}(a) = (a, a)$ and $\text{distr}(a, b) = (a, b)$

Proof. We know $\{e_{\text{contr}}\}(d)$ takes time $|d| + p$, where p is a constant. Then, let $l, h \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \geq p + |e_{\text{contr}}|$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(h) \geq cp$. Define l_{contr} to be $l + h + [1]_{\mathcal{L}}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l_{\text{contr}}) \geq |e_{\text{contr}}|$. Now, let $j, d \Vdash_A a$. This implies that $j \geq_{\mathcal{L}} !k$ where $k, d \Vdash_A a$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}h + !k + !k &\geq_{\mathcal{L}} !k + !k \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(h + !k + !k) &\geq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(h) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k) \\ &\geq cp + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k)\end{aligned}$$

This yields $h + !k + !k, e \Vdash_{!A \otimes !A} (a, a)$. By lemma 11, $h + !k + !k \leq_{\mathcal{L}} h + !k + [1]_{\mathcal{L}} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} h + j + [1]_{\mathcal{L}} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} j + l_{\text{contr}}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{contr}}\}(d)) &\leq |d| + p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(k) + p \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + !k, !k + [1]_{\mathcal{L}}) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + !k, !k + [1]_{\mathcal{L}} + l) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + !k + h, !k + [1]_{\mathcal{L}} + l + h) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + !k + h, !k + l_{\text{contr}})\end{aligned}$$

This proves contr to be a morphism.

Let $e_{\text{distr}} = e_{\text{id}}$. We know $\{e_{\text{id}}\}(d)$ takes constant time, say p . Then, let $l, h \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \geq p + |e_{\text{distr}}|$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(h) \geq cp$. l_{distr} is then defined as $l + !h$. Now, let $j, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{!A \otimes !B} (a, b)$. This means that $j \geq !k + !i$, where $k, d \Vdash_A a$ and $i, c \Vdash_B b$. This in turn means that $k + i + h, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$ and $!(k + i + h), \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{!(A \otimes B)} (a, b)$. Moreover

$$!(k + i + h) = !k + !i + !h \leq_{\mathcal{L}} j + !h \leq_{\mathcal{L}} j + l_{\text{distr}}$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{distr}}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)) &\leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + i + h, j + !h) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + i + h, j + !h + l) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!k + i + h, j + l_{\text{distr}})\end{aligned}$$

This proves distr to be a morphism. $\square$

Lemma 13 (Functoriality) *If $f : A \xrightarrow{e, \varphi} B$, then there is ψ such that $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \psi} !B$*

Exponential Rules and Contraction.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{! \Gamma \vdash !A} P \quad \frac{\Gamma, !A, !A \vdash B}{\Gamma, !A \vdash B} C$$

Figure 2: Intuitionistic Elementary Affine Logic

Proof. Let θ be $! \varphi$ and suppose $d, l \Vdash_{!A} a$. Then $l \geq !h$, where $d, h \Vdash_A a$. Observe that there must be j, c such that $c, j \Vdash_B f(a)$, $j \leq_{\mathcal{L}} h + \varphi$ and $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(j, h + \varphi)$. But then $c, !j \Vdash_{!B} f(a)$ and, moreover

$$\begin{aligned} !j &\leq_{\mathcal{L}} !(h + \varphi) = !h + !\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{L}} !h + \theta \\ \text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(j, h + \varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!j, !(h + \varphi)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!j, !h + !\varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!j, l + \theta) \end{aligned}$$

This means that $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \theta} !B$. □

Elementary bounds can be given on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l)$ depending on $|l|$ and $\text{depth}(l)$:

Proposition 1 *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an elementary function $p_n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(l) \leq p_{\text{depth}(l)}(|l|)$.*

Proof. We prove a stronger statement by induction on n : for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an elementary function $q_n : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every l, e , $\mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, l) \leq q_{\text{depth}(l)}(|l|, e)$. First of all, we know that $\mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) = 0$, so q_0 is just the function which always returns 0. q_{n+1} is defined from q_n as follows: $q_{n+1}(x, y) = 3^y(x + y) + q_n(x, 3^y(x + y))$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_e(\text{empty}, \text{cons}(n, l)) &= 3^e(n + e) + \mathcal{D}_{3^e(n+e)}(\text{empty}, l) \\ &\leq 3^e(|\text{cons}(n, l)| + e) + q_{\text{depth}(l)}(|l|, 3^e(n + e)) \\ &\leq 3^e(|\text{cons}(n, l)| + e) + q_{\text{depth}(l)}(|\text{cons}(n, l)|, 3^e|\text{cons}(n, l)| + e) \\ &= q_{\text{depth}(\text{cons}(n, l))}(|\text{cons}(n, l)|, e) \end{aligned}$$

At this point we just put $p_n(x) = q_n(x, 0)$. □

We emphasize that Proposition 1 does not assert that the mapping $(n, m) \mapsto p_n(m)$ is elementary. This, indeed, cannot be true because we know EAL to be complete for the class of elementary functions. If, however, $A \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is such that $l \in A$ implies $\text{depth}(l) \leq c$ for a fixed c , then $(l \in A) \mapsto p_{\text{depth}(l)}(|l|)$ is elementary and it is in this way that we will use the above proposition.

4.1 Interpreting Elementary Affine Logic

EAL can be obtained by endowing multiplicative affine logic with a restricted modality. The grammar of formulae is enriched with a new production $A ::= !A$ while modal rules are reported in figure 2. Realizability semantics is extended by $\llbracket !A \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{R}} = !\llbracket A \rrbracket_{\eta}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Theorem 1 *Elementary length spaces form a model of EAL.*

Now, consider the formula

$$\text{List}_{\text{EAL}} \equiv \forall \alpha. !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap !(\alpha \multimap \alpha)$$

Binary lists can be represented as cut-free proofs with conclusion List_{EAL} . Suppose you have a proof $\pi : !^j \text{List}_{\text{EAL}} \multimap !^k \text{List}_{\text{EAL}}$. From the denotation $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{R}}$ we can build a morphism g from $\llbracket \text{List}_{\text{EAL}} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{R}}$ to $B_{\mathcal{L}}$ by internal application to ε, s_0, s_1 . This map then induces a function $f : B \rightarrow B$ as follows: given $w \in B$, first compute a realizer for the closed proof corresponding to it, then apply g to the result.

Exponential Rules and Contraction.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{! \Gamma \vdash ! A} P \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, \dots, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, ! A \vdash B} C$$

Figure 3: Intuitionistic Soft Affine Logic

Remark 2 Notice that elements of $B_{\mathcal{L}}$ can all be majorized by lists with unit depth. Similarly, elements of $\llbracket \text{List}_{\text{EAL}} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{R}}$ corresponding to binary lists can be majorized by lists with bounded depth. This observation is essential to prove the following result.

Corollary 1 (Soundness) Let π be an EAL proof with conclusion $\vdash^{!j} \text{List}_{\text{EAL}} \multimap^{!k} \text{List}_{\text{EAL}}$ and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be the function induced by $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{R}}$. Then f is computable in elementary time.

The function f in the previous result equals the function denoted by the proof π in the sense of [10]. This intuitively obvious fact can be proved straightforwardly but somewhat tediously using a logical relation or similar, see also [10].

5 Soft Length Spaces

The grammar of formulae for SAL is the same as the one of Elementary Affine Logic. Rules are reported in figure 3. We here use a resource monoid whose underlying carrier set is $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{L}| \times \mathbb{N}$. The sum $(l, n) + (h, m)$ of two elements in $|\mathcal{I}|$ is defined as $(l + h, \max\{n, m\})$. For every $e \in \mathbb{N}$, binary relations $\leq_e$ on $|\mathcal{I}|$ can be defined as follows

- $(\text{empty}, n) \leq_0 (\text{empty}, m)$ iff $n \leq m$;
- $(\text{empty}, n) \leq_e (\text{cons}(m, l), p)$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 - (i) $e \leq m + pd$
 - (ii) $(\text{empty}, n) \leq_d (l, p)$
- $(\text{cons}(n, l), m) \leq_e (\text{cons}(p, h), q)$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 - (i) $e + n \leq p + qd$;
 - (ii) $(l, m) \leq_d (h, q)$.

If $\alpha = (l, n) \in |\mathcal{I}|$, then $! \alpha$ will be the couple $(\text{cons}(0, l), n) \in |\mathcal{I}|$. If there is e such that $\alpha \leq_e \beta$, then we will simply write $\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{I}} \beta$. For every α and β with $\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{I}} \beta$, we define the natural number $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha, \beta)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, n), (\text{empty}, m)) &= 0 \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, n), (\text{cons}(m, l), p)) &= m + p \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, n), (l, p)) \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{cons}(n, l), m), (\text{cons}(p, h), q)) &= p - n + q \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((l, m), (h, q)) \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we can define $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha, \beta)$ simply as the maximum integer e such that $\alpha \leq_e \beta$. $|\alpha|$ is the maximum integer appearing inside α , i.e. $|(l, n)| = \max\{|l|, m\}$. The depth $\text{depth}(\alpha)$ of $\alpha = (l, n)$ is $\text{depth}(l)$.

Lemma 14 (Compatibility) $(\text{empty}, 0) \leq_0 \alpha$ for every α . Moreover, if $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in |\mathcal{I}|$ and $\alpha \leq_e \beta$, then $\alpha + \gamma \leq_e \beta + \gamma$.

Proof. The first claim is trivial. To prove the second, we proceed by an induction on the structure of the first component of γ . We just consider the case where the first components of α, β, γ are all different from empty . So, suppose $\alpha = (\text{cons}(n, l), m)$, $\beta = (\text{cons}(p, h), q)$, $\gamma = (\text{cons}(r, j), s)$. By hypothesis, we get $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e + n &\leq p + dq \\ (l, m) &\leq_d (h, q) \end{aligned}$$

Then, $e+n+r \leq p+r+dq \leq p+r+d \max\{q, s\}$ and, by induction hypothesis, $(l+j, \max\{m, s\}) \leq_d (h+j, \max\{q, s\})$. This implies that $\alpha + \gamma \leq_e \beta + \gamma$. $\square$

Lemma 15 (Transitivity) *If $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in |\mathcal{I}|$ are lists and $\alpha \leq_e \beta$, $\beta \leq_d \gamma$, then $\alpha \leq_{d+e} \gamma$.*

Proof. We go by induction on the structure of the first component of γ and we suppose the first components of α, β, γ to be different from *empty*. So, let $\alpha = (\text{cons}(n, l), m)$, $\beta = (\text{cons}(p, h), q)$ and $\gamma = (\text{cons}(r, j), s)$. From the hypothesis, there are $c, b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e + n &\leq p + cq \\ d + p &\leq r + bs \\ (l, m) &\leq_c (h, q) \\ (h, q) &\leq_b (j, s) \end{aligned}$$

But then, by inductive hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (e + d) + n &\leq d + p + cq \leq r + bs + cq \leq r + (b + c)s \\ (l, m) &\leq_{c+b} (j, s) \end{aligned}$$

which yields $\alpha \leq_{d+e} \gamma$. $\square$

Lemma 16 *if $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\alpha \leq_e \beta$, then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha, \beta) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha + \gamma, \beta + \gamma)$*

Proof. This is trivial in view of 14 and the fact that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha, \beta)$ is just $\max\{e \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha \leq_e \beta\}$. $\square$

Lemma 17 *If $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\alpha \leq_e \beta$, $\beta \leq_d \gamma$, then $\mathcal{D}_e(\alpha, \beta) + \mathcal{D}_d(\beta, \gamma) \leq \mathcal{D}_{e+d}(\alpha, \gamma)$.*

Proof. This is trivial in view of 15 and the fact that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha, \beta)$ is just $\max\{e \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha \leq_e \beta\}$. $\square$

Lemma 18 *$(\mathcal{I}, +, \leq_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}})$ is a resource monoid.*

Proof. $(|\mathcal{I}|, +)$ is certainly a commutative monoid. Compatibility of $\leq_{\mathcal{I}}$ follows from lemmas 14 and 15. The two required property on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}$ come directly from lemmas 16 and 17. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, observe that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{cons}(n, \text{empty}), 0)) = n$. This concludes the proof. $\square$

A *soft length space* is a length space on the resource monoid $(\mathcal{I}, +, \leq_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}})$.

Given a soft length space $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$, we can build the length space $!A = (|A|, \Vdash_{!A})$, where $\alpha, e \Vdash_{!A} a$ iff $\beta, e \Vdash_A a$ and $\alpha \geq_{\mathcal{I}} !\beta$. We write $[n, m]_{\mathcal{I}}$ for $(\text{cons}(n, \text{empty}), m)$.

Lemma 19 *For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ and for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ the following inequality holds:*

$$n.\alpha \leq_{n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha)+m} !\alpha + [m, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}}$$

Proof. Let $\alpha = (l, p)$. We go by induction on l . If l is *empty*, then

$$\begin{aligned} n.\alpha &= (\text{empty}, p) \\ !\alpha + [m, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} &= (\text{cons}(m, \text{empty}), \max\{p, 2n\}) \\ n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha) + m &= m \\ \text{empty} &\leq_0 \text{empty} \end{aligned}$$

This implies the thesis. Moreover, if $l = \text{cons}(q, h)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} n.\alpha &= (n.l, p) = (\text{cons}(nq, n.h), p) \\ !\alpha + [m, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} &= (\text{cons}(m, l), \max\{p, 2n\}) \\ n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha) + m &= n(q + p\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(l, p)) + m \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (n.h, p) &\leq_{n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(h,p)+q} !(h, p) + [q, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} = (l, \max\{p, 2n\}) \\ (n(q + p\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(l, p)) + m) + nq &= m + 2nq + np\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(l, p) \\ &\leq m + \max\{p, 2n\}(n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(h, p) + q) \end{aligned}$$

from which the desired inequality easily follows. $\square$

Lemma 20 (Basic Maps) *Given soft length spaces A, B and a natural number $n \geq 1$, there are morphisms:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{contr}_n &: !A \rightarrow \overbrace{A \otimes \dots \otimes A}^{n \text{ times}} \\ \text{distr} &: !A \otimes !B \rightarrow !(A \otimes B) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{contr}(a) = (\overbrace{a, \dots, a}^{n \text{ times}})$ and $\text{distr}(a, b) = (a, b)$

Proof. We define realizers e_{contr}^n for every $n \geq 1$ by induction on n :

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\text{contr}}^1 &= e_{\text{id}} \\ e_{\text{contr}}^{n+1} &= (e_{\text{contr}}^n)^* \circ e_{\text{contr}} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, e_{contr}^n is a realizer for contr_n . Moreover, $\text{Time}(\{e_{\text{contr}}^n\}(x)) \leq n|x| + q_n$, where q_n does not depend on x . Now, let ψ_n be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\psi_n) \geq cp \cdot n$ and φ_{contr}^n be $[q_n, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} + \psi_n$ for every $n \geq 1$. Now, let $\alpha, j \Vdash_{!A} a$. This implies $\alpha \geq_{\mathcal{I}}!(l, m)$, where $(l, m), j \Vdash_A a$. Notice that

$$n.(l, m) + \psi_n, \langle \overbrace{j, \dots, j}^{n \text{ times}} \rangle \Vdash \underbrace{A \otimes \dots \otimes A}_{n \text{ times}} (\overbrace{a, \dots, a}^{n \text{ times}})$$

By lemma 19, we finally get

$$\begin{aligned} n.(l, m) + \psi_n &\leq_{\mathcal{I}} !(l, m) + [q_n, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} + \psi_n \\ &= !(l, m) + \varphi_{\text{contr}}^n \leq \varphi_{\text{contr}}^n + \alpha \\ \text{Time}(\{e_{\text{contr}}^n\}(j)) &\leq n|j| + q_n \\ &\leq n\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(l, m) + q_n \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(n.(l, m), !(l, m) + [q_n, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(n.(l, m), (\text{cons}(q_n, l), \max\{m, 2n\})) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(n.(l, m) + \psi_n, (\text{cons}(q_n, l), \max\{m, 2n\}) + \psi_n) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(n.(l, m) + \psi_n, [q_n, 2n]_{\mathcal{I}} + \alpha + \psi_n) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}(n.(l, m) + \psi_n, \alpha + \varphi_{\text{contr}}^n) \end{aligned}$$

This proves each e_{contr}^n to be a morphism.

Let $e_{\text{distr}} = e_{\text{id}}$. We know $\{e_{\text{id}}\}(d)$ takes constant time, say p . Then, let $\psi, \mu \in \mathcal{I}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\psi) \geq p + |e_{\text{distr}}|$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mu) \geq cp$. φ_{distr} is then defined as $\psi + !\mu$. Now, let $\alpha, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{!A \otimes !B} (a, b)$. This implies $\alpha \geq !\beta + !\gamma$, where $\beta, d \Vdash_A a$ and $\gamma, c \Vdash_B b$. This in turn implies $\beta + \gamma + \mu, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$ and $!(\beta + \gamma + \mu), \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{!(A \otimes B)} (a, b)$. Moreover

$$!(\beta + \gamma + \mu) = !\beta + !\gamma + !\mu \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \alpha + !\mu \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \alpha + \varphi_{\text{distr}}$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{e_{\text{distr}}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)) &\leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(\psi) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!(\beta + \gamma + \mu), \alpha + !\mu) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(\psi) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!(\beta + \gamma + \mu), \alpha + !\mu + \psi) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!(\beta + \gamma + \mu), \alpha + \varphi_{\text{distr}}) \end{aligned}$$

Exponential Rules and Contraction.

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A}{\S \Gamma, !\Delta \vdash \S A} P_{\S} \quad \frac{A \vdash B}{!A \vdash !B} P_{!}^1 \quad \frac{\vdash A}{\vdash !A} P_{!}^2 \quad \frac{\Gamma, !A, !A \vdash B}{\Gamma, !A \vdash B} C$$

Figure 4: Intuitionistic Light Affine Logic

This proves *distr* to be a morphism. $\square$

Lemma 21 (Functoriality) *If $f : A \xrightarrow{e, \varphi} B$, then there is ψ such that $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \psi} !B$*

Proof. Let θ be $! \varphi$ and suppose $\alpha, d \Vdash_{!A} a$. Then $\alpha \geq !\beta$, where $\beta, d \Vdash_A a$. Observe that there must be γ, c such that $\gamma, c \Vdash_B f(a)$, $\gamma \leq_{\mathcal{L}} \beta + \varphi$ and $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(\gamma, \beta + \varphi)$. But then $! \gamma, c \Vdash_{!B} f(a)$ and, moreover

$$\begin{aligned} !\gamma &\leq_{\mathcal{L}} !(\beta + \varphi) = !\beta + !\varphi \leq_{\mathcal{L}} !\beta + \theta \\ \text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(\gamma, \beta + \varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!\gamma, !(\beta + \varphi)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!\gamma, !\beta + !\varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{L}}(!\gamma, \alpha + \theta) \end{aligned}$$

This implies $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \theta} !B$. $\square$

Proposition 2 *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a polynomial $p_n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}(\alpha) \leq p_{\text{depth}(\alpha)}(|\alpha|)$ for every $\alpha \in |\mathcal{I}|$.*

Proof. We go by induction on n . First of all, we know that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, 0), (\text{empty}, m)) = 0$, so p_0 is just the function which always returns 0. p_{n+1} is defined from p_n as follows: $p_{n+1}(x) = x + xp_n(x)$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, 0), (\text{cons}(n, l), m)) &= n + m\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{I}}((\text{empty}, 0), (l, m)) \\ &\leq |(\text{cons}(n, l), m)| + |(\text{cons}(n, l), m)|p_{\text{depth}((l, m))}(|(\text{cons}(n, l), m)|) \\ &= p_{\text{depth}((\text{cons}(n, l), m))}(|(\text{cons}(n, l), m)|). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Again, we do not claim that $(n, m) \mapsto p_n(m)$ is a polynomial (c.f. Remark 2).

Theorem 2 *Soft length spaces form a model of SAL.*

Binary lists can be represented in SAL as cut-free proofs with conclusion

$$\text{List}_{\text{SAL}} \equiv \forall \alpha. !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap (\alpha \multimap \alpha)$$

Corollary 2 (Soundness) *Let π be an SAL proof with conclusion $\vdash !^j \text{List}_{\text{SAL}} \multimap !^k \text{List}_{\text{SAL}}$ and let $f : L \rightarrow L$ be the function induced by $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{F}}$. Then f is computable in polynomial time.*

6 Light Length Spaces

The grammar of formulae for Light Affine Logic is the one from Elementary Affine Logic, enriched with a new production $A ::= \S A$. Rules are reported in figure 4. Light length spaces are a model of Light Affine Logic. The underlying resource monoid is more complex than the ones we encountered so far. This complexity is a consequence of the strange behaviour of modality $!$, which is functorial but does not distribute over tensor (i.e. $!(A \otimes B) \not\equiv !A \otimes !B$).

A *tree* is either *empty* or a triple $node(n, t, T)$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$, t is itself a tree and T is a finite nonempty set of trees. $|\mathcal{T}|$ is the set of all trees. We write $[n]_{\mathcal{T}}$ for the tree $node(n, empty, \{empty\})$. The sum $t + s$ of two trees t and s is defined as follows, by induction on n :

$$\begin{aligned} empty + t &= t + empty = t; \\ node(n, t, T) + node(m, u, U) &= node(n + m, t + u, T \cup U); \end{aligned}$$

Here, more sophisticated techniques are needed. For every $n, e \in \mathbb{N}$, binary relations $\leq_e^n$ on trees can be defined as follows

- $t \leq_e^0 u$ for every $t, u \in |\mathcal{T}|$;
- $empty \leq_e^{n+1} t$ for every $t \in |\mathcal{T}|$;
- $node(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} empty$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 - (i) $m \leq e - d$;
 - (ii) $t \leq_{d^2}^n empty$;
 - (iii) For every $s \in T$, $s \leq_d^n empty$.
- $node(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} node(l, u, U)$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 - (i) $m \leq l + e - d$;
 - (ii) There is a function $f : \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow U$ such that $t \leq_{d^2}^n u + \sum_1^d f(i)$;
 - (iii) For every $s \in T$ there is $z \in U$ with $s \leq_d^n z$.

For every $e, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every trees t and u with $t \leq_e^n u$, we define the natural number $\mathcal{D}_e^n(t, u)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_e^0(t, u) &= 0 \\ \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(empty, empty) &= e + \mathcal{D}_e^n(empty, empty) \\ \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(empty, node(m, t, T)) &= m + e + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(m+e)^2}^n(empty, t + \sum_{i=1}^{m+e} f(i)) \} \\ \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(node(m, t, T), empty) &= e - m + \mathcal{D}_{(e-m)^2}^n(t, empty) \\ \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(node(m, t, T), node(l, u, U)) &= l + e - m + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \} \end{aligned}$$

If t is a tree, then $|t|$ is the greatest integer appearing in t , i.e. $|empty| = 0$ and $|node(n, t, T)| = \max\{n, |t|, \max_{u \in T} |u|\}$.

The depth $depth(t)$ of a tree t is defined as follows: $depth(empty) = 0$ and

$$depth(node(n, t, T)) = 1 + \max\{depth(t), \max_{u \in T} depth(u)\}.$$

Given a tree $t \in |\mathcal{T}|$, we define $!t$ as the tree $node(1, empty, \{t\})$ and $\S t$ as the tree $node(0, t, \{empty\})$. In this context, a notion of isomorphism between trees is needed: we say that trees t and u are *isomorphic* and we write $t \cong u$ iff for every $e, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every tree v the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} v \leq_e^n t &\Leftrightarrow v \leq_e^n u \\ t \leq_e^n v &\Leftrightarrow u \leq_e^n v \\ \mathcal{D}_e^n(v, t) &= \mathcal{D}_e^n(v, u) \\ \mathcal{D}_e^n(t, v) &= \mathcal{D}_e^n(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 22 $empty \cong [0]_{\mathcal{T}}$. Moreover, for every tree t , $t + empty \cong t + [0]_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. We have to prove that for every $e, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every tree v :

$$\begin{aligned} v \leq_e^n empty &\Leftrightarrow v \leq_e^n [0]_{\mathcal{T}} \\ empty \leq_e^n v &\Leftrightarrow [0]_{\mathcal{T}} \leq_e^n v \\ \mathcal{D}_e^n(v, empty) &= \mathcal{D}_e^n(v, [0]_{\mathcal{T}}) \\ \mathcal{D}_e^n(empty, v) &= \mathcal{D}_e^n([0]_{\mathcal{T}}, v) \end{aligned}$$

We go by induction on n , considering the case where $n \geq 1$, since the base case is trivial. First of all, observe that both $\text{empty} \leq_e^{n+1} t$ and $[0]_{\mathcal{T}} \leq_e^{n+1} t$ for every t . Moreover, $\text{empty} \leq_e^{n+1} \text{empty}$ and $[0]_{\mathcal{T}} \leq_e^{n+1} \text{empty}$. Suppose now that $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} \text{empty}$. This means that there is d such that

- (i) $m \leq e - d$;
- (ii) $t \leq_{d^2}^n \text{empty}$;
- (iii) for every $s \in T$, $s \leq_d^n \text{empty}$.

If we put $f(i) = \text{empty}$ for every i , we get $t \leq_{d^2}^n \text{empty} + \sum_{i=1}^d f(i)$, which yields $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} [0]_{\mathcal{T}}$. In the same way, we can prove that if $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} [0]_{\mathcal{T}}$, then $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} \text{empty}$.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) &= e + \mathcal{D}_{e^2}^n(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) \\
\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{empty}, [0]_{\mathcal{T}}) &= e + \mathcal{D}_{e^2}^n(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) \\
\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}([0]_{\mathcal{T}}, \text{empty}) &= e + \mathcal{D}_{e^2}^n(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) \\
\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{empty}, \text{node}(m, t, T)) &= m + e + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(m+e)^2}^n(\text{empty}, t + \sum_{i=1}^{m+e} f(i)) \} \\
&= \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}([0]_{\mathcal{T}}, \text{node}(m, t, T)) \\
\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{empty}) &= e - m + \mathcal{D}_{(e-m)^2}^n(t, \text{empty}) \\
&= \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), [0]_{\mathcal{T}})
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{empty} + \text{empty} = \text{empty} &\cong [0]_{\mathcal{T}} = [0]_{\mathcal{T}} + \text{empty} \\
\text{node}(m, t, T) + \text{empty} &= \text{node}(m, t, T) + [0]_{\mathcal{T}}
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3 (Compatibility) *For every $n, e \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{empty} \leq_e^n t$ for every t and, moreover, if $t \leq_e^n u$ then $t + v \leq_e^n u + v$ for every t, u, v .*

Proof. $\text{empty} \leq_e^n t$ is trivial. The second statement can be proved by induction on n . The base case is trivial. In the inductive case, we can suppose all the involved trees to be different from empty . Suppose that $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} \text{node}(l, u, U)$. We should prove $\text{node}(m + k, t + v, T \cup V) \leq_e^{n+1} \text{node}(l + k, u + v, U \cup V)$. However,

$$\begin{aligned}
m + k &\leq (l + e) - d + k = (l + k + e) - d \\
t + v &\leq_{d^2}^n u + \sum_{i=1}^d f(i) + v = u + v + \sum_{i=1}^d f(i)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for every $z \in T \cup V$ there certainly exists $w \in U \cup V$ such that $z \leq_d^n w$. $\square$

Proposition 4 (Transitivity) *If $t \leq_e^n u \leq_d^n v$, then $t \leq_{d+e}^n v$.*

Proof. We go by induction on n . We can directly go to the inductive case, since if $n = 0$, then the thesis is trivial. We can assume all the involved trees to be different from empty . Let us suppose $\text{node}(m, t, T) \leq_e^{n+1} \text{node}(l, u, U)$ and $\text{node}(l, u, U) \leq_d^{n+1} \text{node}(k, v, V)$. First of all, we have $m \leq l + e - c$ and $l \leq k + d - b$, which yields $m \leq k + d - b + e - c = k + (d + e) - (b + c)$.

Moreover, by hypothesis, there are functions $f : \{1, \dots, c\} \rightarrow U$ and $g : \{1, \dots, b\} \rightarrow V$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} t &\leq_{c^2}^n u + \sum_{i=1}^c f(i) \\ u &\leq_{b^2}^n v + \sum_{i=1}^b g(i) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by inductive hypothesis and by proposition 3:

$$\begin{aligned} t &\leq_{c^2+b^2}^n v + \sum_{i=1}^c f(i) + \sum_{i=1}^b g(i) \\ &\leq_{bc}^n v + \sum_{i=1}^c h(i) + \sum_{i=1}^b g(i) \end{aligned}$$

where $h : \{1, \dots, c\} \rightarrow V$. We can then find a function $k : \{1, \dots, c+b\} \rightarrow V$ such that

$$t \leq_{(c+b)^2}^n v + \sum_{i=1}^{c+b} k(i).$$

Finally, if $z \in T$ then we find $w \in U$ such that $z \leq_c^n w$. We then find $x \in V$ such that $w \leq_b^n x$ and so $z \leq_{c+b}^n x$. $\square$

Proposition 5 For every n, e and for every t, u, v , $\mathcal{D}_e^n(t, u) \leq \mathcal{D}_e^n(t + v, u + v)$

Proof. We can proceed by induction on n and, again, the case $n = 0$ is trivial. In the inductive case, as usual, we can suppose all the involved trees to be different from *empty*. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(l, u, U)) \\ &= l + e - m + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \} \\ &= l + e - m + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \end{aligned}$$

where f and realizes the max. By induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(l, u, U)) \\ &\leq (l + k) + e - (m + k) + \mathcal{D}_{((l+k)+e-(m+k))^2}^n(t + v, u + v + \sum_{i=1}^{(l+k)+e-(m+k)} f(i)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T) + \text{node}(k, v, V), \text{node}(l, u, U) + \text{node}(k, v, V)) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 6 $\mathcal{D}_e^n(t, u) + \mathcal{D}_d^n(u, v) \leq \mathcal{D}_{e+d}^n(t, v)$

Proof. We can proceed by induction on n and, again, the case $n = 0$ is trivial. In the inductive

case, as usual, we can suppose all the involved trees to be different from *empty*. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(l, u, U)) + \mathcal{D}_d^{n+1}(\text{node}(l, u, U), \text{node}(k, v, V)) \\
&= l + e - m + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \} \\
&\quad + k + d - l + \max_g \{ \mathcal{D}_{(k+d-l)^2}^n(u, v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i)) \} \\
&= k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}_{(k+d-l)^2}^n(u, v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i)) \\
&= k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2}^n(t, u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}_{(k+d-l)^2}^n(u + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i), v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \\
&\leq k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2 + (k+d-l)^2}^n(t, v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i))
\end{aligned}$$

A function $h : \{1, \dots, l + e - m\} \rightarrow V$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i) \leq_{(l+e-m)(k+d-l)}^n \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} h(i)$ can be easily defined, once we remember that $\text{node}(l, u, U) \leq_d^n \text{node}(k, v, V)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(l, u, U)) + \mathcal{D}_d^{n+1}(\text{node}(l, u, U), \text{node}(k, v, V)) \\
&\leq k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)^2 + (k+d-l)^2}^n(t, v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i)) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}_{(l+e-m)(k+d-l)}^n(v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} f(i), v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} h(i)) \\
&\leq k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(k+(e+d)-m)^2}^n(t, v + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d-l} g(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{l+e-m} h(i)) \\
&\leq k + (e + d) - m + \mathcal{D}_{(k+(e+d)-m)^2}^n(t, v + \sum_{i=1}^{l+(d+e)-m} p(i))
\end{aligned}$$

where $p : \{1, \dots, l + (d + e) - m\} \rightarrow V$, $p(i) = f(i)$ if $i \leq l + e - m$ and $p(i) = g(i - (l + e - m))$ otherwise. But, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(l, u, U)) + \mathcal{D}_d^{n+1}(\text{node}(l, u, U), \text{node}(k, v, V)) \\
&\leq \mathcal{D}_{e+d}^n(\text{node}(m, t, T), \text{node}(k, v, V))
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 23 For every t, u, e , if $t \leq_e^{\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}} u$, then for every $n > \max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}$, $t \leq_e^n u$ and $\mathcal{D}_e^n(t, u) = \mathcal{D}_e^{\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}}(t, u)$.

Proof. A straightforward induction on $\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}$. $\square$

The binary relation $\leq_{\mathcal{T}}$ on $|\mathcal{T}|$ is defined by putting $t \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u$ whenever $\text{depth}(t) \leq \text{depth}(u)$ and $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u)} u$. $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is defined by letting $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t, u) = \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(u)}(t, u)$.

Lemma 24 $\mathcal{T} = (|\mathcal{T}|, +, \leq_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}})$ is a resource monoid.

Proof. $(|\mathcal{T}|, +)$ is certainly a commutative monoid. For every t , $t \leq_{\mathcal{T}} t$, as can be proved by induction on t : $\text{empty} \leq_0^{\text{empty}}$ by definition and, moreover, $t = \text{node}(m, u, U) \leq_0^{\text{depth}(t)} t$ because, by inductive hypothesis, $u \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u)} u$ which yields, by lemma 23, $u \leq_0^{\text{depth}(t)-1} u$. In the same way, we can prove that, for every $v \in U$, $v \leq_0^{\text{depth}(t)-1} v$. Now, suppose $t \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u$ and $u \leq_{\mathcal{T}} v$. This means that $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u)} u$, $u \leq_0^{\text{depth}(v)} v$, $\text{depth}(t) \leq \text{depth}(u)$ and $\text{depth}(u) \leq \text{depth}(v)$. We can then conclude that $\text{depth}(t) \leq \text{depth}(v)$, that $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(v)} u$ (by lemma 23) and $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(v)} v$ (by proposition 6). This in turn yields $t \leq_{\mathcal{T}} v$. Let us now prove compatibility: suppose $t \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u$ and let v be a tree. Then $\text{depth}(t) \leq \text{depth}(u)$ and $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u)} u$. If $\text{depth}(v) \leq \text{depth}(u)$, then $\text{depth}(u+v) = \text{depth}(u)$ and we can proceed by getting $t+v \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u+v)} u+v$ (by proposition 3), which means $t+v \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u+v$. If, on the other hand, $\text{depth}(v) > \text{depth}(u)$, then we can first apply lemma 23 obtaining $t \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u+v)} u$ and then $t+v \leq_0^{\text{depth}(u+v)} u+v$ (by proposition 3). By way of lemma 23 and propositions 6 and 5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t, u) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(u, v) &= \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(u)}(t, u) + \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(v)}(u, v) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(v)}(t, u) + \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(v)}(u, v) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(v)}(t, v) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t, v) \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t, u) &= \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(u)}(t, u) \leq \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(u+v)}(t, u) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_0^{\text{depth}(u+v)}(t+v, u+v) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(t+v, u+v) \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

A *light length space* is a length space on the resource monoid $\mathcal{T} = (|\mathcal{T}|, +, \leq_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}})$. Given a light length space $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$, we can define:

- The light length space $!A = (|A|, \Vdash_{!A})$ where $t, e \Vdash_{!A} a$ iff $u, e \Vdash_A a$ and $t \geq_{\mathcal{T}} !u$.
- The light length space $\S A = (|A|, \Vdash_{\S A})$ where $t, e \Vdash_{\S A} a$ iff $u, e \Vdash_A a$ and $t \geq_{\mathcal{T}} \S u$.

The following results states the existence of certain morphisms and will be useful when interpreting light affine logic.

Lemma 25 (Basic Maps) *Given light length spaces A, B , there are morphisms: $\text{contr} : !A \rightarrow !A \otimes !A$, $\text{distr} : \S A \otimes \S B \rightarrow \S(A \otimes B)$ and $\text{derelict} : !A \rightarrow \S A$ where $\text{contr}(a) = (a, a)$ and $\text{distr}(a, b) = (a, b)$ and $\text{derelict}(a) = a$.*

Proof. We know that $\{e_{\text{contr}}\}(d)$ takes time at most $|d| + p$, where p is a constant. Then, let $t, u \in |\mathcal{T}|$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \geq p + |e_{\text{contr}}|$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u) \geq cp$. Define t_{contr} to be $t + u + [2]_{\mathcal{T}}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t_{\text{contr}}) \geq |e_{\text{contr}}|$. Now, let $v, d \Vdash_{!A} a$. This means that $v \geq_{\mathcal{T}} !w$ where $w, d \Vdash_A a$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} u + !w + !w &\geq_{\mathcal{T}} !w + !w \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u + !w + !w) &\geq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(!w) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(!w) \\ &\geq cp + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(!w) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(!w) \geq |\langle d, d \rangle| \end{aligned}$$

This implies $u + !w + !w, |\langle d, d \rangle| \Vdash_{!A \otimes !A} (a, a)$. Moreover, $u + !w + !w = u + !w + [1]_{\mathcal{T}} \leq_{\mathcal{T}} v + t_{\text{contr}}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{e_{\text{contr}}\}(d)) &\leq |d| + p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(w) + \mathcal{F}_{\text{trees}}(t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(u + !w + !w, !w + t_{\text{contr}}) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(u + !w + !w, v + t_{\text{contr}}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves contr to be a morphism.

Let $e_{\text{distr}} = e_{\text{id}}$. We know that $\{e_{\text{id}}\}(d)$ takes constant time, say at most p . Then, let $t, u \in |\mathcal{T}|$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \geq p + |e_{\text{distr}}|$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u) \geq cp$. t_{distr} is then defined as $t + \S u$. Now, let

$v, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{\S A \otimes \S B} (a, b)$. This implies that $v \geq \S w + \S x$, where $w, d \Vdash_A a$ and $x, c \Vdash_B b$. This in turn means that $w + x + u, \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$ and $\S(w + x + u), \langle d, c \rangle \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$. Moreover

$$\S(w + x + u) = \S w + \S x + \S u \leq v + t_{distr}$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{e_{distr}\}(\langle d, c \rangle)) &\leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(0, t) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S(w + x + u), v + \S u) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S(w + x + u), v + t_{distr}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves *distr* to be a morphism.

Let $e_{derelict} = e_{id}$. We know that $\{e_{derelict}\}(d)$ takes constant time, say at most p . Then, let $t_{distr} \in |\mathcal{T}|$ be such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t_{distr}) \geq p + |e_{derelict}|$. Now, let $v, d \Vdash_{!A} a$. This means that $v \geq !w$, where $w, d \Vdash_A a$. This in turn means that $\S w, d \Vdash_{\S A} a$. Moreover

$$\S w \leq !w \leq !w + t_{derelict}.$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Time}(\{e_{derelict}\}(d)) &\leq p \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t_{derelict}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(0, t_{derelict}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S w, !w) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S w, !w + t_{derelict}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves *derelict* to be a morphism. $\square$

Lemma 26 *For every $t \in |\mathcal{T}|$, there is u such that, for every v , $!(v + t) \leq_{\mathcal{T}} !v + u$.*

Proof. First of all we will prove the following statement by induction on t : for every t , there is an integer $\bar{t}$ such that for every u , $u + t \leq_{\bar{t}}^{\max\{\text{depth}(u), \text{depth}(t)\}} u$. If $t = \text{empty}$, we can choose $\bar{t}$ to be just 0, since $u \leq_0^n u$ for every u . If $t = \text{node}(m, v, V)$, then we put $\bar{t} = m + \bar{v} + \sum_{w \in V} \bar{w}$. Let u be an arbitrary tree and let us assume, without losing generality, that $u = \text{node}(l, w, W)$. Let $d = \bar{v} + \sum_{w \in V} \bar{w}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} l + m &\leq l + m + (\bar{v} + \sum_{w \in V} \bar{w}) - (\bar{v} + \sum_{w \in V} \bar{w}) \\ &= l + \bar{t} - d \\ v + w &\leq_{\bar{v}}^{\max\{\text{depth}(v), \text{depth}(w)\}} w \\ &\leq_0^{\max\{\text{depth}(v), \text{depth}(w)\}} w + \sum_{i=1}^d \text{empty} \\ \forall x \in V.x &\leq_{\bar{x}}^{\text{depth}(x)} \text{empty} \\ \forall x \in W.x &\leq_0^{\text{depth}(x)} x \end{aligned}$$

Using known results, we can rewrite these inequalities as follows

$$\begin{aligned} l + m &\leq l + \bar{t} - d \\ v + w &\leq_{d^2}^{\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}-1} w + \sum_{i=1}^d \text{empty} \\ \forall x \in V.x &\leq_d^{\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}-1} \text{empty} \\ \forall x \in W.x &\leq_d^{\max\{\text{depth}(t), \text{depth}(u)\}-1} x \end{aligned}$$

This yields $u + t \leq_{\bar{t}}^{\max\{\text{depth}(u), \text{depth}(t)\}} t$.

Let us now go back to the lemma we are proving. We will now prove that for every t , any term $u = \text{node}(\bar{t}, w, U)$ such that $\text{depth}(u) = \text{depth}(t) + 1$ satisfies the thesis. Indeed, if we put $d = \bar{t}$ and $n = \text{depth}(v + t)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \bar{t} - d + 1 \\ \text{empty} &\leq_{d^2}^n u \\ v + t &\leq_d^n v \end{aligned}$$

This, in turn implies $!(v + t) \leq_0^{n+1} !v + u$, which yields $!(v + t) \leq_{\mathcal{T}} !v + u$. $\square$

Lemma 27 (Functoriality) *If $f : A \xrightarrow{e, \varphi} B$, then there are ψ, θ such that $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \psi} !B$ and $f : \S A \xrightarrow{e, \theta} \S B$.*

Proof. Let ξ be the tree obtained from φ by lemma 26 and put $\psi = \xi + \varphi + [1]_{\mathcal{T}}$. Suppose that $t, d \Vdash_A a$. Then $t \geq !u$, where $u, d \Vdash_A a$. Observe that there must be v, c such that $v, c \Vdash_B f(a)$, $v \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u + \varphi$ and $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u + \varphi) \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(v, u + \varphi)$. But then $!v, c \Vdash_{!B} f(a)$ and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} !v &\leq_{\mathcal{T}} !(u + \varphi) \leq_{\mathcal{T}} !u + \xi \leq_{\mathcal{T}} t + \psi \\ \text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(v, u + \varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(!v, !(u + \varphi) + [1]_{\mathcal{T}}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(!v, !u + \xi + [1]_{\mathcal{T}}) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(!v, t + \psi) \end{aligned}$$

This means that $f : !A \xrightarrow{e, \psi} !B$. Now, let θ be $\S \varphi$ and suppose $t, d \Vdash_{\S A} a$. Then $t \geq \S u$, where $u, d \Vdash_A a$. Observe that there must be v, c such that $v, c \Vdash_B f(a)$, $v \leq_{\mathcal{T}} u + \varphi$ and $\text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(u + \varphi) \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(v, u + \varphi)$. But then $\S v, c \Vdash_{\S B} f(a)$ and, moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \S v &\leq_{\mathcal{T}} \S(u + \varphi) = \S u + \S \varphi \leq_{\mathcal{T}} t + \theta \\ \text{Time}(\{e\}(d)) &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(v, u + \varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S v, \S(u + \varphi)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S v, \S u + \S \varphi) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}(\S v, t + \theta) \end{aligned}$$

This means that $f : \S A \xrightarrow{e, \theta} \S B$. $\square$

Now, we can prove a polynomial bound on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t)$:

Proposition 7 *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a polynomial $p_n : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}}(t) \leq p_{\text{depth}(t)}(|t|)$.*

Proof. We prove a stronger statement by induction on n : for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a polynomial $q_n : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every t, e , $\mathcal{D}_e^n(\text{empty}, t) \leq q_n(|t|, e)$. First of all, we know that $\mathcal{D}_e^0(\text{empty}, t) = 0$, so q_0 is just the function which always returns 0. q_{n+1} is defined from q_n as follows: $q_{n+1}(x, y) = x + y + q_n(x(x + y + 1), (x + y)^2)$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) &= e + \mathcal{D}_e^n(\text{empty}, \text{empty}) \\ &\leq e + q_n(0, e) \leq e + |\text{empty}| \\ &\quad + q_n(|\text{empty}|(|\text{empty}| + e + 1), (|\text{empty}| + e)^2) \\ &= q_{n+1}(|\text{empty}|, e) \\ \mathcal{D}_e^{n+1}(\text{empty}, \text{node}(m, t, T)) &= m + e + \max_f \{ \mathcal{D}_{(m+e)^2}^n(\text{empty}, t + \sum_{i=1}^{m+e} f(i)) \} \\ &\leq m + e + q_n((m + e + 1)(|\text{node}(m, t, T)|), (m + e)^2) \\ &\leq |\text{node}(m, t, T)| + e \\ &\quad + q_n(|\text{node}(m, t, T)| + e + 1, (|\text{node}(m, t, T)| + e)^2) \\ &\leq q_{n+1}(|\text{node}(m, t, T)|, e) \end{aligned}$$

At this point, however, it suffices to put $p_n(x) = q_n(x, 0)$. $\square$

As for EALand SAL, we cannot claim $(n, m) \mapsto p_n(m)$ to be a polynomial. However, this is not a problem since we will be able to majorize binary strings by trees with bounded depth (cf. Remark 2).

6.1 Interpreting Light Affine Logic

As for the $!$ modality, $\llbracket \S A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}} = \S \llbracket A \rrbracket_\eta^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Theorem 3 *Light length spaces form a model of LAL.*

Binary lists can be represented in LAL as cut-free proofs with conclusion

$$List_{\text{LAL}} \equiv \forall \alpha. !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap !(\alpha \multimap \alpha) \multimap \S(\alpha \multimap \alpha)$$

Corollary 3 (Soundness) *Let π be an LAL proof with conclusion $\vdash \{!, \S\}^j List_{\text{LAL}} \multimap \{!, \S\}^k List_{\text{LAL}}$ and let $f : B \rightarrow B$ be the function induced by $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{R}}$. Then f is computable in polynomial time.*

7 Interpreting LFPL

In [8] one of us had introduced another language, LFPL, with the property that all definable functions on natural numbers are polynomial time computable. The key difference between LFPL and other systems is that a function defined by iteration or recursion is not marked as such using modalities or similar and can therefore be used as a step function of subsequent recursive definitions.

In this section we will describe a resource monoid $\mathcal{M}$ for LFPL, which will provide a proof of polytime soundness for that system. This is essentially the same as the proof from [8], but more structured and, hopefully, easier to understand.

The new approach also yields some new results, namely the justification of second-order quantification, a $!$ -modality, and a new type of binary trees based on cartesian product which allows alternative but not simultaneous access to subtrees.

7.1 Overview of LFPL

LFPL is intuitionistic, affine linear logic, i.e., a linear functional language with $\otimes, \multimap, +, \times$. Unlike in the original presentation we also add polymorphic quantification here. In addition, LFPL has basic types for inductive datatypes, for example unary and binary natural numbers, lists, and trees. There is one more basic type, namely $\Diamond$, the resource type.

The recursive constructors for the inductive datatypes each take an additional argument of type $\Diamond$ which prevents one to invoke more constructor functions than one. Dually to the constructors one has iteration principles which make the $\Diamond$ -resource available in the branches of a recursive definition. For example, the type $T(X)$ of X -labelled binary trees has constructors **leaf** : $T(X)$ and **node** : $\Diamond \multimap X \multimap T(X) \multimap T(X) \multimap T(X)$. The iteration principle allows one to define a function $T(X) \multimap A$ from closed terms A and $\Diamond \multimap X \multimap A \multimap A \multimap A$.

In this paper we “internalise” the assumption of closedness using a $!$ -modality.

Using this iteration principle one can encode recursive definitions by ML-style pattern matching provided recursive calls are made on structurally smaller arguments only.

Here is a fragment of an LFPL program for “treesort” written in functional notation: the additional arguments of type $\Diamond$ are supplied using $@$. Note that the insert function takes an extra argument of type $\Diamond$.

```
let insert x t d = match t with
  Leaf -> Node(x,Leaf,Leaf)@d
| Node(y,l,r)@d' ->
  if x<=y then Node(y,insert x l d,r)@d'
  else Node(y,l,insert x r d)@d'

let extract t = match t with
  Leaf -> nil
| Node(x,l,r)@d ->
  append (extract l) (cons(x,extract r)@d)
```

7.2 A Resource Monoid for LFPL

The underlying set of $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of pairs (l, p) where $l \in \mathbb{N}$ is a natural number and p is a monotone polynomial in a single variable x . The addition is defined by $(l_1, p_1) + (l_2, p_2) = (l_1 + l_2, p_1 + p_2)$, accordingly, the neutral element is $0 = (0, 0)$. We have a submonoid $\mathcal{M}_0 = \{(l, p) \in \mathcal{M} \mid l = 0\}$.

To define the ordering we set $(l_1, p_1) \leq (l_2, p_2)$ iff $l_1 \leq l_2$ and $(p_2 - p_1)(x)$ is monotone and nonnegative for all $x \geq l_2$. For example, we have $(1, 42x) \leq (42, x^2)$, but $(1, 42x) \not\leq (41, x^2)$. The distance function is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}((l_1, p_1), (l_2, p_2)) = (p_2 - p_1)(l_2)$$

We can pad elements of $\mathcal{M}$ by adding a constant to the polynomial. The following is now obvious.

Lemma 28 *Both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_0$ are resource monoids.*

A simple inspection of the proofs in Section 3.1 shows that the realisers for all maps can be chosen from $\mathcal{M}_0$. This is actually the case for an arbitrary submonoid of a resource monoid. We note that realisers of elements may nevertheless be drawn from all of $\mathcal{M}$. We are thus led to the following definition.

Definition 1 *An LFPL-space is a length space over the resource monoid $\mathcal{M}$. A morphism from LFPL length space A to B is a morphism between length spaces which admits a majorizer from $\mathcal{M}_0$.*

Proposition 8 *LFPL length spaces with their maps form a symmetric monoidal closed category.*

Definition 2 *Let A be an LFPL space and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The LFPL space A^n is defined by $|A^n| = |A|$ and $\alpha, e \Vdash_{A^n} a$ iff $\alpha \geq (2n - 1) \cdot \beta$ for some β such that $\beta, e \Vdash_A a$.*

So, A^n corresponds to the subset of $A \otimes \cdots \otimes A$ consisting of those tuples with all n components equal to each other. The factor $2n - 1$ (“modified difference”) instead of just n is needed in order to justify the linear time needed to compute the copying involved in the obvious morphism from A^{m+n} to $A^m \otimes A^n$.

Let I be an index set and A_i, B_i be I -indexed families of LFPL spaces. A uniform map from $(A_i)_i$ to $(B_i)_i$ consists of a family of maps $f_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$ such that there exist e, α with the property that $\alpha, e \Vdash f_i$ for all i . Recall that, in particular, the denotations of proofs with free type variables are uniform maps.

Proposition 9 *For each A there is a uniform (in m, n) map $A^{m+n} \rightarrow A^m \otimes A^n$. Moreover, A^1 is isomorphic to A .*

The LFPL-space $\diamond$ is defined by $|\diamond| = \{\diamond\}$ and put $\alpha, d \Vdash_{\diamond} \diamond$ if $\alpha \geq (1, 0)$.

For each LFPL-space A we define LFPL-space $!A$ by $!A| = |A|$ and $\alpha, t \Vdash_{!A} a$ if there exists $\alpha' = (0, p) \in \mathcal{M}_0$ with $\alpha', t \Vdash_A a$ and $\alpha \geq (0, (x + 1)p)$.

Proposition 10 *There is an LFPL space $\diamond$ and for each LFPL space A there is an LFPL space $!A$ with the following properties:*

- $!A| = |A|$.
- If $f : A \rightarrow B$ then $f : !A \rightarrow !B$.
- $!(A \otimes B) \simeq !A \otimes !B$.
- The obvious functions $!A \otimes \diamond^n \rightarrow A^n \otimes \diamond^n$ are a uniform map.

The last property means intuitively that with n “diamonds” we can extract n copies from an element of type $!A$ and get the n “diamonds” back for later use.

Proof. We have $(0+1)p(0) = p(0) \geq |t|$. Compatibility with $\otimes$ is obvious.

For functoriality assume that $\phi, e \Vdash f$ where $\phi = (0, q) \in \mathcal{M}_0$. We claim that $(0, (x+1)q), e \Vdash f$ *qua* morphism from $!A$ to $!B$. Suppose that $\alpha, t \Vdash_{!A} a$ where $\alpha \geq (0, (x+1)p)$ and $(0, p), t \Vdash_A a$. Since f is a morphism, we obtain v, β such that $\beta, v \Vdash_B f(a)$ and $\beta \leq \phi + (0, p)$. This implies that $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_0$ as well, say, $\beta = (0, r)$ where $r \leq p + q$. We also know that $r(0) \geq |v|$ by the definition of length spaces. Now $(0, (x+1)r), v \Vdash_{!B} f(b)$. On the other hand $(x+1)r \leq (x+1)(p+q)$. The resource bounds are obvious.

Finally, consider the required morphism $!A \otimes \Diamond^n \rightarrow A^n \otimes \Diamond^n$. Clearly, it may be realised by the identity; we claim that 0 can serve as a majoriser. Indeed, a majoriser of $(a, d) \in !A \otimes \Diamond^n$ is of the form $(2n-1, (x+1)p)$ where $(0, p)$ majorises a in A . Now, $(2n-1, (2n-1)p)$ is a majoriser of (a, d) in $A^n \otimes \Diamond^n$. But $((x+1) - (2n-1)p)$ is monotone and nonnegative above $2n-1$. $\square$

Remark We remark at this point that we obtain an alternative resource monoid $\mathcal{M}_S$ for SAL whose underlying set and ordering are as in $\mathcal{M}$, but whose addition is given by addition as $(l_1, p_1) + (l_2, p_2) = (\max(l_1, l_2), p_1 + p_2)$. Length spaces over $\mathcal{M}_S$ with maps majorised by $\mathcal{M}_S$ (not $\mathcal{M}_0$) then also form a sound model of SAL. This points to a close relationship between LFPL and SAL and also shows a certain tradeoff between the two systems. The slightly more complex model is needed for LFPL since in LFPL the C-rule of SAL is so to say internalised in the form of the uniform map $!A \otimes \Diamond^n \rightarrow A^n \otimes \Diamond^n$. Notice that SAL's map $!A \rightarrow A^n$ cannot be uniform. This uniformity of LFPL allows for an internal implementation of datatypes and recursion as we now show.

Definition 3 Let T_i be a family of LFPL spaces such that $|T_i| = T$ independent of i . The LFPL space $\exists i.T_i$ is defined by $|\exists i.T_i| = |T|$ and $\alpha, e \Vdash_{\exists i.T_i} t$ if $\alpha, e \Vdash_{T_i} t$ for some i .

Note that if we have a uniform family of maps $T_i \rightarrow U$ where U does not depend on i then we obtain a map $\exists i.T_i \rightarrow U$ (existential elimination).

Conversely, if we have a uniform family of maps $U_i \rightarrow V_{f(i)}$ then we get a uniform family of maps $U_i \rightarrow \exists j.V_j$ (existential introduction). We will use an informal “internal language” to denote uniform maps which when formalised would amount to an extension of LFPL with indexed type dependency in the style of Dependent ML [15].

7.3 Inductive Datatypes

In order to interpret unary natural numbers, we define $N = \exists n.N_n$ where

$$N_n = \Diamond^n \otimes \forall A.(A \multimap A)^n \multimap A \multimap A$$

We can internally define a successor map $\Diamond \otimes N_n \rightarrow N_{n+1}$ as follows: starting from $d : \Diamond, \vec{d} : \Diamond^n$ and $f : \forall(A \multimap A)^n \multimap A \multimap A$ we obtain a member of $\Diamond^{n+1}$ (from d and $\vec{d}$) and we define $f' : \forall(A \multimap A)^{n+1} \multimap A \multimap A$ as $\lambda(u^{A \multimap A}, \vec{u}^{(A \multimap A)^n}). \lambda z^A. u(f \vec{u} z)$. From this, we obtain a map $\Diamond \otimes N \rightarrow N$ by existential introduction and elimination.

Of course, we also have a constant zero $I \rightarrow N_0$ yielding a map $I \rightarrow N$ by existential introduction.

Finally, we can define an iteration map

$$!(\Diamond \otimes A \multimap A) \multimap N_n \multimap A \multimap A$$

as follows: Given $t : !(\Diamond \otimes A \multimap A)$ and $(\vec{d}, f) \in N_n$ we unpack t using Proposition 10 to yield $t' \in ((\Diamond \otimes A) \multimap A)^n$ as well as $\vec{d} \in \Diamond^n$. Feeding these “diamonds” one by one to the components of t' we obtain $t'' \in (A \multimap A)^{\otimes n}$. But then $f t''$ yields the required element of $A \multimap A$.

Existential elimination now yields a single map

$$!(\Diamond \otimes A \multimap A) \multimap N \multimap A \multimap A$$

Similarly, we can interpret binary X -labelled trees using a type family

$$T_n = \diamond^n \otimes \forall (X \multimap A \multimap A \multimap A)^n \multimap A^{n+1} \multimap A$$

and defining trees proper as $\exists n.T_n$. We get maps **leaf** : T_0 and **node** : $\diamond \otimes X \otimes T_{n_1} \otimes T_{n_2} \rightarrow T_{n_1+n_2+1}$ and an analogous iteration construct.

Finally, and this goes beyond what was already known, we can define “lazy trees” using cartesian product (also known as additive conjunction).

First, we recall from ordinary affine linear logic that an additive conjunction can be defined as

$$A \times B = \forall C.(C \multimap A) \otimes (C \multimap B) \otimes C$$

The first projection map $A \times B \rightarrow A$ is given internally by $\lambda(f^{C \multimap A}, g^{C \multimap B}, c^C).f$ c . Analogously, we have a second projection. Given maps $f : C \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ we obtain a map $\langle f, g \rangle : C \rightarrow A \times B$ internally as $\lambda c^C.(f, g, c)$.

Now, following the pattern of the binary trees $T_{m,n}$ above, we define another family

$$T_d^\times = \diamond^d \otimes \forall A.(X \multimap (A \times A) \multimap A)^d \multimap A \multimap A$$

and $T^\times = \exists d.T_d^\times$. We get maps **leaf** : $\diamond \rightarrow T_0^\times$ and **node** : $\diamond \otimes X \otimes (T_{d_1} \times T_{d_2}) \rightarrow T_{1+\max(d_1, d_2)}$ as well as an analogous iteration construct.

We describe in detail the construction of the “node” map which is not entirely straightforward. First, we note that for any length spaces A, B and m, n the obvious map $(\diamond^m \otimes A) \times (\diamond^n \otimes B) \rightarrow \diamond^{\max(m, n)} \otimes (A \times B)$ is a morphism. This is because a majoriser of an element of $(\diamond^m \otimes A) \times (\diamond^n \otimes B)$ must be of the form (k, p) where $k \geq \max(m, n)$ in view of the existence of the projection maps.

Now suppose we are given (internally) $d : \diamond, x : X, lr : T_{d_1}^\times \times T_{d_2}^\times$. Using the just described morphism we decompose lr into $\vec{d} : \diamond^{\max(d_1, d_2)}$ and $lr' : W_{d_1} \times W_{d_2}$ where $W_i = (X \multimap (A \times A) \multimap A)^i \multimap A \multimap A$. We have stripped off the universal quantifier.

Now d and $\vec{d}$ together yield an element of $\diamond^{1+\max(d_1, d_2)}$. It remains to construct a member of $W_{1+\max(d_1, d_2)}$. To this end, we assume $u : X \multimap (A \times A) \multimap A$ and $f : (X \multimap (A \times A) \multimap A)^{\max(d_1, d_2)}$ and define the required element of A as $u \ x \ \langle lr'.1 \ f \ a, lr'.2 \ f \ a \rangle$. Here $.1$ and $.2$ denote the projections from the cartesian product. The sharing of the variables f, a, lr' is legal in the two components of a cartesian pairing, but would of course not be acceptable in a $\otimes$ pairing. We have elided the obvious coercions from $(_)^{\max(d_1, d_2)}$ to $(_)^{d_i}$.

We remark that these cartesian trees are governed by their depth rather than their number of nodes. We also note that if $X = I$ we can form the function $\lambda d^\diamond. \lambda t^{T^\times}. \mathbf{node} \ d \ () \ \langle t, r \rangle : \diamond \multimap T^\times \multimap T^\times$. Iterating this map yields a function $N \multimap T^\times$ computing full binary trees of a given depth. Of course, on the level of the realisers, such a tree is not laid out in full as this would require exponential space, but computed lazily as subtrees are being accessed. Exploring the implications of this for programming is left to future work.

8 Conclusion

We have given a unified semantic framework with which to establish soundness of various systems for capturing complexity classes by logic and programming. Most notably, our framework has all of second-order multiplicative linear logic built in, so that only the connectives and modalities going beyond this need to be verified explicitly.

While resulting in a considerable simplification of previous soundness proofs, in particular for LFPL and LAL, our method has also lead to new results, in particular polymorphism and a modality for LFPL.

The method proceeds by assigning both abstract resource bounds in the form of elements from a resource monoid and resource-bounded computations to proofs (respectively, programs). In this way, our method can be seen as a combination of traditional Kleene-style realisability (which only assigns computations) and polynomial and quasi interpretation known from term rewriting

(which only assigns resource bounds). An altogether new aspect is the introduction of more general notions of resource bounds than just numbers or polynomials as formalised in the concept of resource monoid. We thus believe that our methods can also be used to generalise polynomial interpretations to (linear) higher-order.

References

- [1] Andrea Asperti and Luca Roversi. Intuitionistic light affine logic. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 3(1):137–175, 2002.
- [2] Patrick Baillot and Virgile Mogbil. Soft lambda-calculus: a language for polynomial time computation. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures*, 2004.
- [3] Stephen Bellantoni, Karl Heinz Niggl, and Helmut Schwichtenberg. Higher type recursion, ramification and polynomial time. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 104:17–30, 2000.
- [4] Stephen Cook and Alasdair Urquhart. Functional interpretations of feasible constructive arithmetic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 63(2):103–200, 1993.
- [5] Paolo Coppola and Simone Martini. Typing lambda terms in elementary logic with linear constraints. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Typed Lambda-Calculus and Applications*, pages 76–90, 2001.
- [6] John Crossley, Gerald Mathai, and Robert Seely. A logical calculus for polynomial-time realizability. *Journal of Methods of Logic in Computer Science*, 3:279–298, 1994.
- [7] Jean-Yves Girard. Light linear logic. *Information and Computation*, 143(2):175–204, 1998.
- [8] Martin Hofmann. Linear types and non-size-increasing polynomial time computation. In *Proceedings of the 14th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 464–473, 1999.
- [9] Martin Hofmann. Safe recursion with higher types and BCK-algebra. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 104:113–166, 2000.
- [10] Martin Hofmann and Philip Scott. Realizability models for BLL-like languages. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 318(1-2):121–137, 2004.
- [11] Georg Kreisel. Interpretation of analysis by means of constructive functions of finite types. In Arend Heyting, editor, *Constructivity in Mathematics*, pages 101–128. North-Holland, 1959.
- [12] Yves Lafont. Soft linear logic and polynomial time. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 318:163–180, 2004.
- [13] Ugo Dal Lago and Martin Hofmann. Quantitative models and implicit complexity. Unpublished. Available from <http://www.cs.unibo.it/~dallago/research.html>, 2005.
- [14] Peter van Emde Boas. Machine models and simulation. In *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, Volume A: Algorithms and Complexity*, pages 1–66. Elsevier, 1990.
- [15] Hongwei Xi and Frank Pfenning. Dependent types in practical programming. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 214–227, 1999.